1979

Australian attitudes to the traditional cultural sex role stereotypes

Robyn Rowland
University of Wollongong

AUSTRALIAN ATTITUDES TO THE TRADITIONAL CULTURAL SEX ROLE STEREOTYPES

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

from

THE UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

by

ROBYN ROWLAND, B.A. (HONS.)

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

1979

806350.

The work contained in this thesis has not been submitted for a degree at any other university or such institution.

Abstract

The present study investigated Australian attitudes to traditional cultural sex roles. A pilot study was conducted from which a test battery was designed. This battery consisted of four scales: a Semantic Differential with five concepts (*Typical Man, Typical Woman, Self, Ideal Man* and *Ideal Woman*), an Adjective Value List (to assess the social desirability of stereotypic characteristics), the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, and an Attitude to Sex Roles Questionnaire. The battery was administered to a general population sample of 148 women and 154 men from Wollongong, New South Wales, Australia, selected by a multi-stage sampling process. A set of five hypotheses was investigated.

The Semantic Differential and Bem Sex-Role Inventory results indicate that Self and Ideal descriptions involving traditional masculine and feminine characteristics are more masculine-oriented for women than was expected. Both 'expressive' and 'competency' clusters of traits were viewed as socially desirable for men and women. Results from the Attitude to Sex Roles Questionnaire indicate that, although women were more liberal than men in their attitudes to sex roles, responses in general were not conservative. Thus the results indicate that, although some traditionally oriented beliefs continue to prevail, some attitudes do appear to have liberalised, making Australian attitudes to sex roles appear as less rigid than the literature portrays (Encel, MacKenzie, and Tebbutt, 1974). The problems associated with the tests used in this study are considered in detail. Finally, a discussion of present and future research concludes with a

consideration of the methodological problems involved in sex role research.

Acknowledgements

The writer wishes to acknowledge with gratitude the help of the following people:

Professor A.M. Clarke, Deputy Vice-Chancellor and Professor of Psychology, University of Wollongong, for his steady support and encouragement, and for his friendship.

Dr. B. Walker, Supervisor, University of Wollongong, for her help and her comments.

Dr. B.S. Parsonson, Senior Lecturer, Psychology Department, University of Waikato, New Zealand, for invaluable help with a draft of the thesis and for his encouragement.

Mr Trevor Q. Irwin, critic and perfectionist, who helped me create a challenge out of obstacles, and who stood close at all times; who showed me that "love is the wedge that smashes the atom" (William Carlos Williams).

Gwen and Norm Rowland, who equiped me for the task in the thousand ways that parents can, often without knowing and most often with little reward.

And to those many people who are an essential part of the structure of such a work, at both Wollongong and Waikato, but particularly Garrielle Smith and Jacqui Russell. Thanks are also extended to Christine Ruffell for her excellent typing and persistence with the task, which I very much appreciated.

The writer is indebted to the Australian Commonwealth Government for the award of a post-graduate

research scholarship, to the Psychology Department, University of Wollongong for the use of facilities during that period, and to the Psychology Department, University of Waikato, for the use of facilities there in the last two years.

The main findings of this research have been presented at the following conferences, and have been published in the following Journals:

Women's perceptions of the Typical Woman, the Self and the Ideal Woman. Display and Discussion Paper, Australian Psychological Society Annual Conference, Melbourne, 1975.

Australian attitudes to sex roles: general population data. Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, Christchurch, 1978.

Androgyny: Does the Bem Sex-Role Inventory measure it? Annual Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, 1979.

Attitudes to sex roles: a discussion of data and of methodology. Annual Conference of the Sociological Association of Australia and New Zealand, Canberra, 1979.

Sex Role Research: An Overview. Annual Conference of the New Zealand Psychological Society, Palmerston North, 1979.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Australian Psychologist, 1977, 12, 83-88.

Australian data on the Attitude to Women Scale: Norms, sex differences, reliability. Australian Psychologist, 1977, 12, 327-331.

Reply to Russell, Antill and Cunningham (1978). Australian Psychologist, 13, 240-243.

A Final reply to Russell, Antill & Cunningham. Australian Psychologist, 1978, 13, 421-422.

The Attitudes to Women Scale: A Note of caution. Australian Psychologist, 1979, 14, 97-98.

Women's perceptions of the Typical woman, the Self and the Ideal woman. Abstract of paper presented to A.Ps.S. Conference, 1975, Canadian Newsletter of Research on Women, 1977, 6, 56.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Appendices

List of Tables

Chapter One Introduction

Research into sex role stereotypes: A review of the literature leading to a statement of hypotheses.

1.1 Introduction

The study of sex roles has emerged from a social-psychological base (Lipman-Blumen & Tickamyer, 1975) and has been influenced by changes which occurred in the study of the psychology of women in the 1960's. Before the impact of the Women's Movement in this period, research associated with sex differences was prominent and served the purpose of supporting the status quo of sex role divisions (Frieze, Parsons, Johnson, Ruble, & Zellman, 1978). The interaction of science and society has been discussed in detail in the literature (Bryson, 1979; Fenwick, 1979; Frieze et al., 1978; Lipman-Blumen & Tickamyer, 1975; Vaughter, 1976; Winkler, 1973). Through its methodology, that is, the choice of topic for study, the choice of subjects and the method of investigation, and through the interpretation of its findings, psychology has reflected and supported societal beliefs about sex roles (Frieze et al., 1978).

Recent research, however, has concentrated on bringing a new awareness to theory and research, emphasising the need to develop human potential rather than characteristics and roles which are traditionally sex-specific (Bem, 1974, 1975; Vaughter, 1976). Many writers call for social change and a weakening of the traditional sex-typed roles in society (for example, Mercer, 1975; Vaughter, 1976; Weitz, 1977; Williams, 1977). Weitz (1977) argues that three maintenance systems, biological, psychological and social,

contribute to the stability and continuity of sex roles. She contends that before change is implemented it is necessary to understand these methods of maintaining the status quo. But it is also essential to understand which sex role attitudes and behaviours are prevalent in society before change can be assessed or implemented. In Australia there is little empirical research into these aspects.

Before discussing Australian attitudes to sex roles it is necessary to clarify the term 'sex role'. As Spence and Helmreich (1978) point out, there is a "muddled literature regarding the use of the term" (p.13). Sex role research which is relevant to this thesis will then be discussed. The majority of this literature is North American. The current knowledge of attitudes to sex roles in Australia will be considered and the aims of the research in this thesis outlined.

1.2 A discussion of the term 'sex role' and the related terminology

Within the area of sex role research there is confusion surrounding the terms which are used to describe biological and cultural sex differences. The basic terms which are in conflict are: gender, gender identity and gender role, and sex, sexual identity (orientation) and sex role or sex role identity.

The difficulty arises because of the necessity to distinguish between behaviours and characteristics which are

biologically determined and therefore, for the most part, immutable, and those which are culturally determined and therefore changeable.

Often both the terms 'sex' and 'gender' are used to indicate biological sex. Oakley (1972), Walum (1977) and Vaughter (1976) for example, all use 'sex' to describe the "biological differences between male and female: the visible difference in genitalia, the related difference in procreative function" (Oakley, 1972, p.16). 'Gender' is used for the same purpose by Spence and Helmreich (1978), Chafetz (1974), Forisha (1978), and Worrell (1978). Worrell (1978) defines it as "categorical distinctions between males and females regardless of their behaviours" (p.781).

Difficulties arise, however, with the introduction of 'role' or 'identity'. Generally the term 'sexual identity' or 'sexual orientation' is used to indicate sexual proclivities, that is, it is a term associated with sexuality (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). But the terms 'gender role' and 'sex role' are often used interchangeably (Donelson & Gullahorn, 1977).

The authors who use 'sex' as a biological term often use 'gender' to describe the cultural roles prescribed for the sexes (Oakley, 1972; Vaughter, 1976; Walum, 1977). Vaughter (1976) exemplifies this usage when she describes sex <u>role</u> as "defined biologically by the structure and function of the reproductive system" which includes "menstruation, gestation,

lactation, spermatogenesis and ejaculation" (p.122). For her, the gender role is culturally prescribed and "consists of all optional and prescribed attributes, attitudes and behaviours defined appropriate for and expected of females and males within the culture" (p.123). Walum (1977) in this group describes gender identity as containing appropriate "role performances, personality structures, attitudes and behaviours" (p.6). But in their discussion of the Money and Ehrhardt studies, Frieze et al. (1978) suggest that gender identity is the biological maleness or femaleness while gender-role identity is the socially defined role (p.86). As Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) note, frequently the terms 'identity' and 'role' are used interchangeably when related to 'gender'.

Alternatively, writers who prefer 'gender' to indicate biological sex usually employ 'sex role' to refer to the cultural roles of the sexes (Block, 1973; Chafetz, 1974; Forisha, 1978; Frieze et al., 1978; Hartley, 1964; Weitz 1978; and Worrell, 1978). Worrell (1978) describes sex roles as "cultural expectations about attitudes, beliefs, and behaviours associated with masculinity and femininity" (p.781).

The term 'sex role' is used often in a very general sense. Frieze et al. (1978) and Weitz (1977) use the term in their book titles, and under it discuss biological, psychological and social aspects of sex roles. Even the

journal Sex Roles seems to convey this ambiguity in definition. It discusses manuscripts associated with both the "processes underlying gender-role socialization" and "sex role stereotypes" and attitudes. An explanation for this may lie in the fact that the journal is multi-disciplinary, publishing work from a variety of disciplines; it takes contributions from psychology, sociology, anthropology, education and political science. And this appears to be the crux of the matter. The study of sex roles, as it is termed, covers a number of disciplines with varying definitions and methodology. The concept 'sex role' has thus gathered a number of associations and become in some senses a general as well as specific term. Spence and Helmreich (1978), Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) and Angrist (1969) all make this point in similar ways.

Angrist (1969) has attempted to clarify the term by considering three core usages. The first usage refers to normative expectations about the position of women and men and emphasises the division of labour according to sex. This approach is stressed mainly by anthropologists. The second usage concerns the process of role taking and stresses socialization and relationships within groups or societies. It is used mainly by sociologists, for example, Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975). And the third usage refers to behaviours and considers the distinguishing characteristics of women and men themselves (Spence & Helmreich, 1978). It is employed mainly by psychologists and stresses differing characteristics

between men and women in, for example, behaviour, personality, abilities and preferences.

With respect to Angrist's second usage, however, it should be noted that some sociologists have disagreed with the use of the term 'sex role' (for example, Lopata, 1976; Lopata & Thorne, 1978). Among the reasons for their concern over the use of the term, Lopata and Thorne (1978) note that it is questionable whether 'sex role' can be a role in the same sense that 'teacher' is a role, because of its deeper, less changeable aspects and because it really involves more than just one role. Furthermore they contend that the terminology masks questions of power and inequality. That is, the "notion of 'role' has tended to focus attention more on individuals than on social strata, more on socialization than on social structure, and has thereby deflected attention away from historic, economic and political questions" (p.719).

And finally, they feel that concepts such as 'sex roles' and 'sex role stereotyping' are often discussed in the literature as if they exist in actuality rather than as analytic constructs. The authors conclude that "there is no such thing" as sex role, and that 'social role' analysis is more useful.

Lopata and Thorne (1978) do, however, accept that 'sex role' has a positive association in that it affirms an analysis based on learned, cultural behaviour as opposed to the biological and sexual aspects. Reaffirming their

sociological approach, they note that the term also "suggests a social as opposed to psychological approach" (p.720). Not all sociologists would agree on this point though. For example, Scanzoni and Scanzoni (1976) interchange 'sex role' and 'gender role' and define it as a set of expected behaviours according to the different social positions of women and men, but they note that these expectations are related to both temperaments (personality characteristics) and tasks.[1]

Spence and Helmreich (1978) discuss Angrist's (1969) classifications and indicate that the term 'sex role' would be more useful in psychology if it was restricted. They argue that the definition should only consider differences between men and women in appropriate behaviours for the two sexes. Thus, if all types of differences between the sexes are considered, the term becomes too diffuse and lacks clarity, but if it concerns differences in socially expected and appropriate behaviours, it becomes a concept which is easier to study. Furthermore, they suggest that a distinction should be made between the actual enactment of role expectations and the characteristics of the actor. This means that the definition would include both role/behaviour differences and personality differences.

This brief discussion of the term 'sex role' and related terminology illustrates some of the confusion in the literature.

---

[1] To add a further dimension, Williams (1977) writes that 'personality' is culturally determined while 'temperament' is biologically derived (p.398).

It suggests that the definitional problems may stem partly from the fact that different disciplines have contributed to this area of study, each bringing their specific orientations and terminology to bear on it. There are a number of issues which emerge from the discussion of terminology and which need to be clarified before the definition applied in this thesis is stated. These issues relate to 'sex role' as culturally shaped rather than biologically determined.

The first point is that when the term 'sex role' is used it often includes both observable behaviour and personality characteristics. When Broverman, Vogel, Broverman, Clarkson and Rosenkrantz (1972) use the term, they are referring to personality characteristics associated with sex roles. The scale devised by Bem (1974) to assess masculinity, femininity and androgyny also uses personality characteristics and is labelled a Sex Role Inventory. Alternatively, other writers may be referring only to role behaviours (for example, who should do the housework); and often the term includes both aspects (Frieze et al., 1978; Weitz, 1977). Spence and Helmreich (1978) discuss this issue and propose that a clear distinction be made between the two aspects.

The second issue concerns role preference, attitudes and behaviour. The attitudes to sex roles recorded in a study may not necessarily be reflected in the behaviour of individuals. Egalitarian beliefs do not necessarily lead to egalitarian behaviour. Furthermore, measurements of sex role

personality characteristics cannot necessarily be extrapolated to other areas of sex role experience. Spence and Helmreich (1978) note that information about the masculinity or femininity of an individual does not necessarily permit inferences about how sex-typed that person is in interest patterns. So researchers need to ensure that they clarify whether it is the role or personality component of sex roles they are studying and should not extrapolate beyond their findings.

The final issue requiring clarification involves 'sex role stereotypes'. This term is an extension of the cultural 'sex role' definition. The prescribed cultural roles become stereotypic when they are rigidly defined and contain an emotional statement of prejudice. Kimball Young (cited in Klein, 1950) described them as "false, classificatory concepts, to which, as a rule, some strong emotional-feeling tone of like or dislike, approval or disapproval, is attached". Frieze et al. (1978) relate stereotypes to prejudice. They note that prejudice involves negative feelings, that the judgements on which prejudice is based are formed on the basis of incorrect or incomplete information, and that prejudiced views are not easily changed, even in the face of contradictory information. They write that "stereotypes are not causes of prejudices, but are images invoked by the prejudiced individual to justify the prejudice he already has" (p.280).

Stereotypes have a prescriptive element. That is, they

are cultural representations of the way people should behave: they describe the appropriate sex roles and behaviours for males and females. Walum (1977) points out that in each culture the stereotypes become "taken for granted as factual, inalienable, and proved" (p.4). As a result, they tend to be slow to respond to cultural change.

Another facet of the stereotypes commented on by Deaux (1976) concerns a descriptive element. She notes that assumptions about personality traits are widely shared and are believed to apply to nearly all men and women. This descriptive element is the one most closely studied. The prescriptive element is well documented (Bem, 1974; Deaux, 1976; Forisha, 1978; Frieze et al., 1978; Weitz, 1977). But research endeavours to assess whether stereotypes do, in fact, describe the current roles, behaviours and personalities of men and women; whether stereotypes are socially relevant and valid.

Sex role stereotypes seem to be held by many people (Broverman et al., 1972); and, as Chafetz (1978) comments, although they are "descriptively inaccurate" they "do exist and do influence people's feelings and perceptions of self and others" (p.37). Deaux (1976) discusses this issue and notes that one explanation for the existence of stereotypes is that they contain an element of truth, for example, women <u>are</u> more passive than men in general. But often stereotypes are exaggerated beyond this original truth. They then persist, due in part to a selectivity process in people's perception, which allows only

evidence in support of the stereotype to be noticed and remembered.

The aim of this thesis will be to study attitudes[2] to these traditional sex role stereotypes in an Australian sample. Based on the discussion in this section, sex role stereotypes will be defined as *the cluster of personality characteristics and role prescriptions which are traditionally accepted as appropriate for the male and female in Western society.*

The personality characteristics and roles associated with these sex role stereotypes will be outlined and some of the relevant research (mainly North American) discussed before Australian sex roles are considered in comparison.

1.3 Sex role stereotypes: the personality and role components.

1.3.1 A brief note on socialization.

There is a continuing debate in the literature about the origins of sex role divisions, that is, whether they are biologically or culturally based or influenced by both factors. It is, naturally, difficult to isolate these aspects from each

---

[2] A detailed discussion of the term 'attitude', located elsewhere in the literature (Allport, 1935; McGuire, 1969; Oskamp, 1977), will not be included here owing to space limitations. Oskamp (1977) notes that in recent years the evaluative aspect of attitudes has been stressed, and that 'attitude' is now generally seen as a disposition to respond to an attitude object in a favourable or unfavourable manner. Bem (1970) offers a simple definition which states that "attitudes are likes or dislikes" (p.14). But Fishbein and Ajzen's (1975) definition may be the most useful in this thesis. They write of an attitude as "a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favourable or unfavourable manner with respect to a given object" (p.6). As attitudes to sex roles have not been shown to be necessarily an indicator of behaviour, the 'readiness to act' aspect of attitudes included in some definitions (for example, Allport, 1935) cannot be assumed and this thesis stresses the evaluative nature of the term.

other so research is inconclusive (Weitz, 1977).

The important point about this controversy is that the 'biological' argument should not be used to justify the lower status of women in general. Even if there are biological determinants of sex role behaviour, it should not be assumed that women are therefore ill-equipped to cope with a variety of life-roles or that they have innate characteristics which should exclude them from many spheres of activity. In fact, biological differences probably do affect behaviour (Bardwick, 1970; Hutt, 1972; Weitz, 1977) but the process of socialization has been demonstrated to have a stronger influence on the present sex role divisions in society (Frieze et al., 1978). The socialization argument is strongly supported by studies such as those of Money and Ehrhardt (1972) which indicate that children can be socialized into a role which is the opposite of their biological sex. Furthermore, cross-cultural studies show that different cultures produce different sex role divisions (Mead, 1935).

There are a number of theories of sex role socialization. Frieze et al. (1978) discuss three major theoretical approaches: the psychoanalytically based identification theory; reinforcement and social learning theory; and cognitive-developmental theories. Briefly, the identification theories contend that sex role behaviour is acquired through identification with an appropriate same-sex model. The social learning theorists concentrate on behavioural laws using the principles of reinforcement and

modelling to explain sex role acquisition. The third group, the cognitive-developmental theorists, account for sex role development through the child's cognitive organisation and not parental reinforcement, modelling or identification.

More recent theories have emerged, however, which differ from these approaches by stressing that sex role development becomes a process rather than a stage which is 'attained'. Rebecca, Hefner, and Oleshansky (1976) and Pleck (1975)[3] have suggested a three stage model of sex role development in which the final stage is 'androgynous' or 'transcendent'. This final stage represents a non-stereotyped position where the individual exhibits flexible behaviour rather than 'sex-appropriate' behaviour.

The socialization of sex role behaviour continues throughout the life of the individual as social pressures reinforce differing behaviours and roles based on sex. The process is difficult for girls (Bardwick, 1972) but equally restrictive for boys (Hartley, 1959). While females are encouraged to learn interpersonal skills which will equip them for their role, males are encouraged to acquire 'mastery' skills which will prepare them for their work-oriented life. This often leaves both men and women deficient in the alternative sets of skills (Jourard, 1971). Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) sum up the situation when they write that

---

[3]Discussed further in Chapter 5.

"one consistency exists from childhood through maturity: males are socialised by prescription, females by proscription" (p.305).

1.3.2 The personality characteristics of the sex role stereotypes

The sex role stereotypes in Western Society include groups of personality characteristics which are culturally accepted as appropriate for women and men. These characteristics are cited often in the literature (Broverman et al., 1972; Chafetz, 1974; Deaux, 1976; Oakley, 1972; Walum, 1977), and Bardwick and Douvan (1972) give an example of the types of characteristics which make up the 'stereotypic personality'. The traditional female characteristics are:

> Dependence, passivity, fragility, low pain tolerance, nonaggression, noncompetitiveness, inner orientation, interpersonal orientation, empathy, sensitivity, nurturance, subjectivity, intuitiveness, yieldingness, receptivity, inability to risk, emotional liability (sic), supportiveness (p.52).

> The corresponding male characteristics are:

> Independence, aggression, competitiveness, leadership, task orientation, outward orientation, assertiveness, innovation, self-discipline, stoicism, activity, objectivity, analytic-mindedness, courage, unsentimentality, rationality, confidence, and emotional control (p.52).

These lists suggest some points which are characteristic of stereotypic personality descriptions. Firstly, many of the characteristics are 'opposites'. Thus while males are independent and active, females are dependent and passive. This allocation of contrasting characteristics to the sexes is reflected in the common usage of 'opposite sex' to refer to the sex which is not one's own (Chafetz, 1978).

A second point is that female characteristics are often viewed as negative and less socially desirable than male characteristics (Bardwick, 1972; Chafetz, 1974, 1978; Deaux, 1976). A number of studies illustrate this. McKee and Sherriffs (1959), Eastman (1958) and MacBrayer (1960) all found that both women and men regard males more highly than females. Goldberg (1968) found a strong bias against women in the assessment of articles of professional literature. Broverman et al. (1972), in a study using their Stereotype Questionnaire, concluded that masculine characteristics were perceived as more desirable than were feminine characteristics, and Elman, Press and Rosenkrantz (1970) noted a similar finding.

Thus people value characteristics which are ascribed to men more highly than those ascribed to women. Deaux (1976) summarises these points about the stereotypic characteristics when she writes:

> Generally, men are described by a series of traits that reflect competence, rationality and assertiveness. Men, for example, are viewed as independent, objective, active, competitive, adventurous, self-confident and ambitious. Women are seen as possessing the opposite of each of these traits. They are characterised as dependent, subjective, passive, not competitive, not adventurous, not self-confident and not ambitious. In each instance, people have indicated that the trait the male possesses is the most desirable trait for someone in our Western culture (p.13).

There are also some positive characteristics associated with women as well as with men. These characteristics generally reflect warmth and expressiveness. But men also have some characteristics associated with them which carry negative connotations. They are, for example, blunt, rough, unaware of

the feelings of others and unable to express their own feelings (Deaux, 1976; Frieze et al., 1978). The difference is that more of the male characteristics are viewed as socially desirable (Chafetz, 1978).

There is a possibility, however, that this situation is changing. A study by Der-Karabetian and Smith (1977) found, contrary to Broverman et al. (1972), that female subjects in their study valued feminine attributes more positively than masculine attributes. They conclude that women's attitudes to previously negative feminine characteristics may be becoming more positive, even though stereotypes have not changed very much.

This recent study indicated some change in the desirability of characteristics and this needs to be further researched as a great deal of present evidence comes from studies of the 1950's. But both recent and early studies indicate that there is a strong consensus as to the characteristics which are ascribed to males and females (Broverman et al., 1972; Der-Karabetian & Smith, 1977; Ellis & Bentler, 1973; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Sherriffs & Jarrett, 1953).

In their appraisal of sex role research, Broverman et al. (1972) found that male characteristics reflected a "competency" cluster while the female characteristics showed a "warmth and expressiveness" cluster. Again men were characterised as independent, objective, active, competitive, logical, worldly, able to make decisions easily, and ambitious. Women were characterised by an absence of these traits and were thus

dependent, passive, noncompetitive and illogical. Women were again allocated the positive gentle and sensitive characteristics. The authors concluded that in spite of the "apparent fluidity" of sex roles in contemporary society, sex role stereotypes were persisting. Der-Karabetian and Smith (1977) also found that the traditional way of characterising men and women was still very much in evidence.

The characteristics of the stereotypes have been clearly defined in the literature. Most studies have shown that people agree on the characteristics ascribed to the sexes and on their value or social desirability. But a recent study (Der-Karabetian & Smith, 1977) does indicate that some changes may be taking place in the assessment of the desirability of feminine characteristics.

Self perceptions and the ideal woman and man in relation to the stereotypes. Concepts which have been studied in relation to the stereotype are the 'Self' and the 'Ideal' man and woman. The 'stereotype' is often labelled as the average or typical man or woman, and the 'ideal' represents how the respondent would like men and women to be.

In a study in 1956, Sherriffs and McKee found evidence to suggest that the self-descriptions of respondents were closely aligned with the stereotypes. They also found that when women described their ideal man they selected favourable or positive female characteristics as often as they selected favourable male characteristics. The male respondents, however, chose favourable male characteristics considerably less often than favourable female characteristics in their descriptions of the ideal woman,

although they did include some male characteristics.

Elman, Press, and Rosenkrantz (1970) studied 110 college students' perceptions of self, ideal self and ideal male and female roles. They found that ideal self was closer to the ideal sex roles than to the stereotypes, and that the self-description was closer to the stereotypes than to the ideal man and woman descriptions. The ideal man, woman and self descriptions thus contained opposite-sex characteristics as well as same-sex characteristics.

Again, in their study of 154 college students, Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) also found the self-descriptions to be similar to the stereotypes. But in 1972, after reviewing the available literature, Broverman et al. commented that the ideal man and women also corresponded to the stereotypes. This finding differed from those of other investigators who had found the 'ideal' to be removed from the stereotype (Elman, Press, & Rosenkrantz, 1970; Sherriffs & McKee, 1956).

Extending this line of research, Steinmann and Fox (1968) considered descriptions by males and females of their ideal opposite-sex person. They found that both sexes had similar ideal man and woman descriptions but that their beliefs about what the opposite sex viewed as ideal were dramatically different.

A more recent study by O'Leary and Depner (1975) considered only self and opposite-sex ideals but obtained a finding which may indicate that change is occurring in perceptions of the ideal woman. They found that self-descriptions by both males and

females, and the ideal male description by females, reflected the stereotypes. But the description by males of their ideal woman revealed a "Wonderwoman, characterised as more competent, competitive, successful and adventurous than college females' ratings of their ideal male" (p.140). O'Leary and Depner chose to interpret this as a desire to avoid being labelled as chauvinistic on the part of the males, and this could be correct. However, it may also indicate a change in attitude.

The empirical studies seem to suggest that the self-descriptions of respondents are close to, but differing from, the traditional stereotype and that the ideal male and female descriptions may be removed from the stereotype. However, the findings are not always clear, and it would be useful to examine descriptions of all three concepts, the 'stereotype', the 'self' and the 'ideal' (man and woman), for a group of respondents from the general population.

Masculinity, Femininity and Androgyny. If the finding of a more positive attitude to feminine characteristics (Der-Karabetian & Smith, 1977) is valid, and if self-descriptions are becoming less stereotypic, then it is possible that men and women now perceive themselves as having both positive masculine and feminine characteristics in their personalities.

Many contemporary studies argue that in fact some people do see themselves as possessing both masculine and feminine characteristics (Bem, 1974; Berzins, 1975; Spence, Helmreich & Stapp, 1975; Worrell, 1975). These individuals have been labelled

'androgynous'. The concept of 'androgyny' has developed from a questioning of the dichotomisation of masculinity and femininity and its relevance to all individuals (Bem, 1974; Berzins, 1975; Constantinople, 1973; Jenkin & Vroegh, 1969; Worrell, 1975). Researchers have questioned the use of Masculinity-Femininity scales which did not allow the individual to be "both instrumental *and* expressive, both assertive *and* yielding, both 'masculine' *and* 'feminine' " (Bem, 1974, p.1) or to integrate in the one person what Block (1973) referred to as 'agency' and 'communion'. Block explains that the integration of these two modalities for men

> requires that self-assertion, self-interest, and self-extension be tempered by considerations of mutuality, interdependence and joint welfare.

For women, the integration requires that:

> the concern for harmonious functioning of the group, the submersion of self, and the importance of consensus characteristic of communion be amended to include aspects of agentic-self-assertion and self-expression — aspects that are essential for personal integration and self-actualization (p.515).

When the concept of androgyny was first used by Bem (1974) the androgynous person was one who showed little difference between her or his masculinity and femininity scores on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) pointed out, however, that this masked any possible differences between the people who scored high on masculinity and femininity and those who scored low. After investigation of this possibility the two groups were found to differ on various dimensions and the high scorers only were classified as 'androgynous' while the

low scorers were labelled 'undifferentiated' (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975).[4]

The androgynous person is conceptualized as one who is more flexible and has a wider range of capabilities than the sex-typed individual (Deaux, 1976). He or she can be either warm and subdued or assertive and independent, depending upon the situational appropriateness of her or his behaviour. Androgyny has also been linked with greater mental health (Bem, 1975).

Walum (1977) has pointed out that the concept of androgyny conflicts with three previously held beliefs about masculinity, femininity and sex roles. Firstly, within this conceptualization, masculinity and femininity are not seen as two ends of a continuum, but as independent dimensions. Thus the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, unlike previous Masculinity-Femininity scales, does not conceptualize masculinity and femininity as bi-polar, and force a negative correlation between the two (Constantinople, 1973). Self-descriptions may include both types of characteristics.

Secondly, the assumption that people may change their behaviour depending upon the situation and its demands questions the idea that people are "consistent types". And finally, it challenges "a latent assumption in most social and psychological

---

[4]The Bem Sex-Role Inventory is discussed further in Chapter 2 and its relation to androgyny investigated in Chapter 5.

research: sex typing is good for the individual and for the society" (p.100). Block (1973) feels that the belief that the achievement of masculinity and femininity are not the ultimate goals of sex role development is a more useful one. It leads people to develop a sense of self, secure in gender, but which permits them to express human qualities previously labelled as unmanly or unwomanly.

There is also some disagreement about whether males or females will more easily become androgynous. Block (1973) argues that females are trapped by socialization into the stereotype and that males have the freedom to develop a more flexible personality. She writes that some traditionally feminine characteristics (for example, interdependence) are stressed in the male's socialization while no masculine characteristics (such as assertiveness and achievement motivation) are stressed in female socialization. Thus the sex role definitions are narrowed by socialization for women but broadened for men.

Alternatively, it can be argued that it is easier for females to become androgynous because masculine characteristics are more socially desirable. Thus when developing them in herself, a woman is also gaining socially desirable characteristics. The male, however, in acquiring femininine characteristics accepts those which are less socially desirable. Hartley (1959) and Farrell (1974) have also contended that the male socialization process is harsher than the female experience and is therefore

more rigid and difficult to transverse.

Studies conducted so far suggest that there are groups of people in society who are androgynous and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory is being widely used and discussed (Bem, Martyna, & Watson, 1976; Welling, 1975; Worrell, 1975).

1.3.3 The Stereotypic role

The personality characteristics of the sex role stereotypes are closely related to the roles allocated to the sexes. The traditional role prescribed for women is that of homemaker, wife and mother (Deaux, 1976; Frieze et al., 1978). Thus the stereotypic characteristics of nurturance and warmth are intended to equip the woman for the role of child-rearer. It is in the 'nature' of women to seek their fulfilment in marriage and children within the home (Lundberg & Farnham, 1947).

One characteristic of the woman's traditional role is submission to her husband and the subjugation of her individuality (Friedan, 1965), always putting the welfare of husband and children first. In her extensive study of fifty-one middle-class families Steinmann (1963) discussed this point and noted that the traditional role entailed the woman thinking of herself as the 'other'. She wrote:

> She realises herself indirectly by fostering fulfilment. She performs a nurturing role. Her achievement is to help others to achieve. Her distinguishing feature is that she fulfils herself by proxy (p.284).

Walum (1977) comments that a work role is not acceptable for a married woman; it has been subject to severe criticism. She notes that as domestic workers women are expected to be dedicated

to group, rather than individual, goals.

There are few positive rewards within the traditional role. A double standard exists which praises the role of motherhood and homemaker while ascribing it a very low social status (Myrdal & Klein, 1968). The woman's role is not conceived of as an 'occupation' (Fand, 1955) in the same sense as the male occupational role, which is achievement oriented and has higher social status. This produces role devaluation and strain for women (Lopata, 1971).

But the male role too is rigidly circumscribed and the consequences can be equally negative and difficult to cope with (Farrell, 1974; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974; Walum, 1977). Spence and Helmreich (1972) commented in their study on attitudes to women's role that the study of the psychology of men is in a state of "benign neglect". With the influence of the women's movement in the 1960's, women's roles and their consequences became the focus of research. The male role appeared at first as a positive, problem-free one in comparison. But recently writers have argued that the restrictions imposed on men by the traditional male role can be as dysfunctional as those imposed on women (Farrell, 1974; Fein, 1974; Gould, 1973; Nichols, 1975; Pleck, 1976).

While the female role prescribes that a woman's identity is to be found through a man, the male has to seek his identity through his work. The male role is that of 'breadwinner' and his success at work is the measure of his success as a man (Farrell, 1974). Early death after retirement and suicide

after job loss or failure are evidence of this relationship (Jourard, 1974).

The stereotypic personality equips a man for his role. The characteristics of strength, activity, independence and worldliness are necessary in his supporter role. Again the role and personality characteristics interact. As Theodore Reik (1965) wrote:

> A man's self-evaluation is strictly dependent on how successful he is in his work. A woman's self-evaluation is dependent on the kind of man who chooses her.

These limitations placed on women and men have been shown to be the cause of a number of problems. For example, women may suffer from a lack of individual fulfilment and may experience loss of a sense of 'self' when their child-rearing days are over (Bart, 1976). Men may suffer from an inability to relate interpersonally which can adversely affect their relationships with women and children (Farrell, 1974).

The research into sex roles has concentrated primarily on the attitudes of people to the personality characteristics of the stereotypes. Psychological research into the role component is general and sparse, and much of the role research is found in the sociological literature.

Three major scales have been used in role research in psychology. The Male-Female Role Research (MAFERR) Foundation developed the Inventory of Feminine and Masculine Values (Steinmann & Fox, 1966) which attempted to assess attitudes towards the two roles; Herman and Sedlacek (1973) developed

their racial prejudice scale into the Situational Attitude Scale for Women (SASW); and Spence and Helmreich (1972) constructed the Attitude to Women Scale (AWS). The SASW differed from the other two scales in that it was situation specific, that is, it tested attitudes to women in particular situations, for instance as policewomen or garage attendants. Responses were then compared to those on a similar scale with male protagonists. Herman and Sedlacek (1973) stated that the scale was intended to "measure attitudes of men toward women, or more specifically toward women in non-traditional sex roles" (p.2).

Of these three scales, the AWS appears most frequently in the research literature (Spence & Helmreich, 1972, 1978; Stanley, Boots, & Johnson, 1975; Lunneborg, 1974). In their description of the scale, Spence and Helmreich (1972) comment that it was designed to assess attitudes in the following areas:

> the vocational, educational and intellectual roles of women, freedom and independence, dating, courtship and etiquette, sexual behaviour and marital relationships and obligations (p.66).

Although subtotal scores can be obtained for each of these sections, generally only a total score is compiled and used to label groups as conservative or liberal in their attitude to the traditional female role.

There has been no scale designed to assess attitudes toward the male role nor a combined male/female role questionnaire. Herman and Sedlacek (1973) suggest a possible reason for this. They comment that attitudes toward women and attitudes toward sex roles have been taken as

synonymous, and that because women have agitated for change, the focus has been on their role. Thus although 'sexism' means restricting a person to a specific role on the basis of sex (male or female), it has been accepted as meaning a negative attitude only towards women's roles.

Findings from the role questionnaire studies generally indicate that women are more liberal in their attitudes towards women's roles than are men (Spence & Helmreich, 1972). Yorburg and Arafat (1975) studied sex role conceptions in a wide-ranging sample and found that women were consistently less traditional than men. One possible explanation for these findings is that men feel they have more to lose from a change in traditional roles (Steinmann, 1963), as little stress has been laid on the restrictions of the male role.

The roles allocated to men and women are clearly defined and interrelated with the type of personality characteristics deemed 'suitable' for males and females. These roles have been well established within society but the attitudes of women towards them are liberalising. Deaux (1976), however, comments that "stereotypes are still alive and doing reasonably well in our culture" (p.20).

1.4 Australian sex role stereotypes

Most research into sex roles has been conducted in North America. Australian research has been scarce, with few empirical studies. Most of the literature on sex roles in Australia is historical (Dixson, 1976; Mercer, 1975; Summers, 1975) and this often uses a personal experiential approach

(Wild, 1978). Both Hunt (1972) and Wild (1978) have commented on the lack of in-depth research into male-female relations in contemporary Australian society.

What does emerge from the existing literature is a picture of Australian sex roles that is similar to the traditional cultural stereotypes of most Western countries. The American data are therefore often regarded as relevant to Australian society. However, there are some differences which are peculiarly Australian and which some writers contend lead to a position for women which is lower than that in comparable countries (Dixson, 1977). The 'mateship' ethic and the rigidity of the limitations on the woman's role, particularly with respect to work outside the home, indicate the strength of traditional roles. As Encel, MacKenzie, and Tebbutt (1974) write: "The most notable thing about sex roles in Australia is their clear and rigid segregation" (p.53).

The Australian 'mateship' ethic is supposed to represent a bond of friendship or mateship between Australian males but is in fact based on a false egalitarianism. For example it excludes a person who is an Aborigine, a non-European immigrant or a woman (Bell, 1974; Encel et al., 1974). Encel et al. (1974) point out that it excludes women because it is based on the idea of men as workmates while relationships between men and women are commonly expected to involve a sexual bond.

Dixson (1976) describes the Australian man as "insensitive" and "blockish". He is encouraged from an early age to reject

all things 'feminine', to 'be a man', and must never have his manhood devalued by being labelled a 'cry baby' (Bell, 1974). The characteristics which he is taught are stereotypic. Wishart (1975) summarises them as follows:

> In Australian society the Sex-Role Ideology characterizes the male stereotype as superior to the female stereotype. The masculinity stereotype describes the ideal male as one who is decisive, rugged, virile, strong, unemotional, responsible, ambitious and aggressively self-confident (p.366).

The description of the male role in the family is contradictory. Some writers claim that the man plays a strong family role (Bell, 1974), others that the Australian family is 'mother dominated' (Encel et al., 1974) and others that housework is not necessarily seen by men as wholly the role of women (Stephenson, 1970). What is accepted is that the role of the male is that of breadwinner and supporter of the family.

The Australian woman is stereotyped as the traditional woman with the role of wife, mother and homemaker paramount (Bell, 1974; Dixson, 1976; Mercer, 1975; Stephenson, 1970; Wishart, 1975). Women are said to be viewed by society as less intelligent and self-sufficient than men (Wishart, 1975), as dependent and unable to support themselves (Stephenson, 1970), and as colourless (Dixson, 1976). Qualities such as initiative, autonomy, confidence and courage are presented to a woman as those which society values highly but which it decrees she should not have if she is to be a 'real woman' (Dixson, 1976).

The role of the Australian woman has been so home-oriented that there is strong resistance to working women (Bryson &

Thompson, 1972; Mercer, 1975) and arguments about maternal deprivation are continually cast at the working mother (Encel et al., 1974; Stephenson, 1970). Encel et al. (1974) succinctly summarize the woman's role when they write:

> The 'normal' woman is expected to conform to the stereotype of femininity, seeking her satisfactions in home-pride and the care of husband and children, finding her relaxation in card-parties, tennis and bowls, entertaining friends and relations, tending the garden and watching television. If she is interested in affairs outside the home it is assumed that these should be linked in a fairly direct way to her home experience, such as work for mothers' clubs or child care...(p.42).

Although this situation may be changing, there are few studies indicating change. Workforce figures only indicate the number of women at work, not the attitudes of people towards this situation. One study of three hundred and forty-four (344) Melbourne households in 1972 (Bryson & Thompson) questioned husbands with working wives. Of these, twenty-one percent (21%) disapproved of their wives working, thirty-six percent (36%) approved conditionally (usually because of financial reasons), and forty-three percent (43%) approved unconditionally. Although over half the sample responded conservatively, the percentage of men who approved unconditionally indicates possible changes in attitudes. However, in view of the fact that there has been no comparable empirical data collected previously, statements of possible change are basically speculative.

The rigidity of sex role segregation in Australian society is partly due to the different socializing experiences of men and women. Society channels people into two different streams

socially, educationally and occupationally depending upon their sex (Wishart, 1975). The role of women in the family is emphasized by the fact that few women leave home before they marry (Stephenson, 1970) and thus travel from one family situation to another.

Socially the sexes are also segregated. Social clubs and societies which are 'men only' or 'women only' abound and social occasions are often sex-specific. Parties and social gatherings which are mixed are characterized by the manner in which men stand together talking and drinking and women sit together discussing their children (Encel et al., 1974).

Bell (1974) points out that because of this segregation Australians find it difficult to be friends with members of the opposite sex. This is particularly so after people are married because it is assumed that the basis for a male-female relationship must be sexual.

The sex roles in Australia are thus portrayed as similar to the traditional stereotypes in the North American research. Furthermore, if people attempt to intrude into the opposite sex role sphere they are considered deviant, 'queer' or less important within that role (Wishart, 1975). As indicated, there has been little research conducted in psychology into contemporary sex roles but this trend is beginning to change and some relevant studies have recently emerged (Anderson and the feminist psychology group, 1975; Antill & Cunningham, 1977; Feather, 1978a; Feather, O'Driscoll, & Nagel, 1977; Penman, 1975; Stanley et al.,

1975; Wilson, 1975).

Of these recent studies the most relevant to this thesis is the work of Penman (1975). Penman's study questioned three hundred and eighteen (318) Australian women about their present and future role conceptions. The results indicated that a majority of these women still supported traditional role allocations. They were seeking flexibility and role alternatives but were severely limited in this search by the desire to "satisfy traditional family needs first".

Penman's study did yield some indication that change in sex roles may be occurring and other writers seem confident that change is imminent (Encel et al., 1974; Bell, 1975). The fact that Australians continue to be portrayed as trapped within the stereotypes while little evidence exists as to current sex roles makes research in this area mandatory.

1.5 Aims of the present study and statement of hypotheses

The intention of this study is to provide some contemporary data on sex roles in Australian society by surveying an Australian general population sample using a battery of tests based on the North American research. It is concerned with assessing the social desirability of the traditional stereotypic characteristics for an Australian sample; Australian attitudes to the Typical Man and Woman, the Self, and the Ideal Man and Woman; the distribution of scores on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory in this sample; and the attitudes of women and men toward women's traditional role. A set of hypotheses was suggested by the previous findings outlined in this chapter and these are

listed below:

1. With respect to the social desirability of characteristics (Section 1.3.2):

   For men and women, more masculine than feminine stereotypic characteristics are seen as socially desirable.

2. With respect to the concepts of Typical Man and Woman, Self, and Ideal Man and Woman (Section 1.3.2):

   (i) Men and Women perceive the *Typical Man* and the *Typical Woman* in terms of the traditional cultural male and female stereotypes as defined by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) and in the literature by Bardwick and Douvan (1972).

   (ii) Women perceive a difference between the *Typical Woman*, *Self*, and *Ideal Woman* such that the *Typical Woman* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* as less than the *Self*.

   (iii) The description by men of the *Ideal Woman* contains more traditionally masculine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Woman*.

   (iv) Men perceive a difference between the *Typical Man*, *Self* and *Ideal Man* such that the *Typical Man* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* as less stereotypic than the *Self*.

   (v) The description by women of their *Ideal Man* contains more traditionally feminine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Man*.

3. With respect to Masculinity, Femininity and Androgyny (Section 1.3.2):

   The responses on the Bem Sex-Role Inventory would be investigated for the Australian sample.

4. With respect to roles (Section 1.3.3):

   Women are more liberal in their attitudes towards the traditional female role than are men.

However, before these hypotheses were tested on a general population sample, a pilot study was conducted in order to draw attention to any problems which might occur with the test battery. The pilot study would also provide test-retest reliability figures for the tests for an Australian sample. When these data were collected there was no available information about the use of such tests for an Australian sample.

Chapter Two Pilot Study

2.1 Method - Subjects and Procedure.

- Test Battery.

2.2 Results

2.3 Discussion

2.3.1. Attitudes to Sex Roles Questionnaire.

2.1 Method

Subjects and Procedure

The subjects were students enrolled in undergraduate courses at the University of Wollongong in 1975. They were volunteers and were assured of anonymity by the use of code numbers. On the first testing there were 225 subjects, but on retest, eight weeks later, there remained 191 subjects; 97 females and 94 males.

The age range of the subjects was 17 to 56 years for males and 17 to 47 years for females. The mean ages were 23 years (males and females) and the medians were 21.6 years (males) and 20.5 years (females). Subjects were administered the test battery twice over an eight week period, to obtain test-retest reliability data.

Test Battery

To test the hypotheses for the major study a test battery of four tests was designed. These instruments had been used previously in the North American research. They were: a Semantic Differential with five concepts to be rated, an Adjective Value List, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, and the Attitude to Women Scale.

Semantic differential. As indicated in Chapter One (footnote 2) the present study is concerned with the evaluative element of attitudes. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) note that typically semantic differentials contain three factors: evaluation, potency and activity. The evaluative factor is by far the strongest in most scales

because most adjectives imply positive or negative characteristics. Nunnally (1967) also points out that the factors of potency and activity are not as strong statistically as evaluation and comments:

> The evaluative factor almost serves as a definition for the term "attitude", and consequently scales on the evaluative factor should serve well as measures of verbalised attitudes (p.537).

Osgood (1965) has recommended the use of the evaluative dimension of the semantic differential as an indicator of attitude towards an object. Oskamp (1977) supports this, commenting that it is the more affective dimension, and Moser and Kalton (1971) note that the semantic differential is an excellent attitude assessor.

The Semantic Differential used in this study consisted of twenty-six (26) bi-polar adjectives. These were selected from the Stereotype Questionnaire and had all been rated as stereotypic by an adult population (Broverman, 1970). The Stereotype Questionnaire contained 82 items, but as subjects would be required to rate five concepts with the scale, the number of items was reduced. Selection of the items was based on descriptions of the male and female stereotypes in the literature (for example, Bardwick & Douvan, 1972) and included the most common stereotypic characteristics. The positions of the items in the Semantic Differential list and of the masculine/feminine poles were randomised. A copy of the Semantic Differential can be found in Appendix A, section one.

There were five (5) concepts to be rated on the scale: *The Typical Man, The Typical Woman, Yourself, Your Ideal Man,* and *Your Ideal Woman.* The order of presentation of these concepts was randomised for each subject in the pilot study. Respondents were asked to describe these concepts on a seven (7) point rating scale as follows:

Impractical/Very, Quite, Slightly, Neither, Slightly, Quite, Very/*Practical.*

The choice of a seven point scale was based on Miller's (1956) argument that not more than seven discriminations can be made simultaneously. Furthermore, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) suggest it as a suitable scale.

The feminine pole of the item was given a score of one (1) and the masculine pole a score of seven (7). For the purpose of the test-retest reliability correlations, each concept was given a total score. This procedure is supported by Moser and Kalton (1971) who note that "a respondent's total score ... is the measure of his attitude" (p.134).

Adjective Value List (AVL). To obtain an evaluation of the social desirability of the stereotypic items, an Adjective Value List was constructed which consisted of one pole of each of the 26 items on the Semantic Differential. The pole chosen was randomly selected. Respondents were asked to rate each item as "desirable, undesirable or neither for a typical mature adult (irrespective of sex)". A copy of this scale is contained in Appendix A, section two.

For the pilot study, responses were scored 1 (desirable), 3 (undesirable) and 2 (neither). Subjects could then be allocated a social desirability score.

Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI). The BSRI was developed in an attempt to allow the individual who is not sex-typed to be classified as non sex-typed (Bem, 1974). As mentioned in Chapter One, it avoids what Constantinople (1973) and Bem (1974) see as the basic problem with Masculinity-Femininity scales: it does not conceptualize masculinity and femininity as a bi-polar continuum and therefore force a negative correlation between the two.

The scale consists of 60 adjectives: 20 masculine, 20 feminine, and 20 neutral items with respect to sex. Of the neutral items, half are positive in value and half are negative. The masculine and feminine items were chosen for the scale on the basis of sex-typed desirability. For example, an item was labelled masculine if it was judged to be more desirable in American society for a man than for a woman (Bem, 1974).

Respondents were required to describe themselves using these adjectives and a seven point rating scale. On this scale one (1) indicated that the item was "never or almost never true" of the respondent and seven (7) indicated that it was "always or almost always true" of them (See Appendix A, Section three, for the scale used).

Respondents could obtain both a masculinity and a femininity score. The degree of sex role stereotyping of an individual was defined as the Student's 't'-ratio for the

difference between his or her mean masculinity and femininity scores. This was the androgyny score. The androgynous individual was one who showed little difference between these two scores. This method was designated the 't' ratio method (Bem, 1974; Rowland, 1977).

Bem (1974) tested the inventory for internal consistency. A co-efficient alpha was computed for the masculinity, femininity and social desirability scores and they were all reliable with a Stanford University sample. Students were also retested after a four week period to obtain test-retest reliability data. Product-Moment correlations showed that all four scores were reliable over time: masculinity, r= 0.90; femininity, r= 0.90; androgyny, r= 0.93; social desirability, r= 0.89.

Attitudes toward Women Scale (AWS). The AWS designed by Spence and Helmreich (1972) contained fifty-five (55) questions involving traditional beliefs about women's roles. Questions were categorised into the following groups: vocational, educational and intellectual roles of women; freedom and independence; dating, courtship and etiquette; sexual behaviour; and marital relationships and obligations. The questionnaire is included in Appendix B.

The respondents were required to use a four point rating scale with the categories: Agree Strongly, Agree Mildly, Disagree Mildly, Disagree Strongly. Each item was scored within the range 0-3, zero representing the most traditional and conservative response and three reflecting a liberal response.

Spence and Helmreich (1972) computed a Cronbach alpha to assess the internal consistency of the scale. For both sexes the result was 0.90 (Spence, 1974). They also considered the factor structure of the AWS to be very stable. An image analysis, followed by principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation, was computed.

The first unrotated principal axis factor accounted for about 68 percent of the variance (Stanley et al., 1975). Stanley et al. (1975), however, did not find the AWS Short Form to be unifactorial, but noted that it was a "reliable measure of the attitudes to women" (p.322).

The Semantic Differential, the Adjective Value List, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory and the Attitudes toward Women Scale thus formed the four sections of the test battery which was used in the pilot study. These scales are included in the first three sections of Appendix A and in Appendix B.

2.2 Results

In order to ascertain the temporal reliability of the tests, Pearson Product-Moment correlations were computed on the total scores obtained from the two administrations of the scales eight weeks apart.

For the Semantic Differential, correlations were computed on the five concept totals. The AVL and AWS totals were correlated as were the masculinity (M), femininity (F) and androgyny (A) scores on the BSRI. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Test-retest correlations for the five concept totals on the Semantic Differential, the total AVL and AWS scores and the masculinity (M), femininity (F) and androgyny (A) scores of the BSRI.

	Males	Females
Semantic Differential		
Typical Man	0.61	0.62
Typical Woman	0.53	0.72
Self	0.87	0.84
Ideal Man	0.73	0.78
Ideal Woman	0.69	0.66
AVL	0.72	0.74
AWS	0.92	0.93
BSRI		
M score	0.93	0.88
F score	0.80	0.82
A score	0.86	0.91

All correlation co-efficients significant at $p \leq 0.001$.

2.3 Discussion

The results indicated that the tests were reliable over time. However, a number of problems did emerge with the test battery. Firstly, completion of the test battery was time-consuming and some people needed an hour to finish it. This suggested that respondents from the general population, who would generally be unfamiliar with this type of testing, could be expected to take at least an hour to complete the battery.

Secondly, it became clear that the method of scoring the tests used in the pilot study would only yield very general results. Detailed analysis of responses would be necessary in the main study to adequately test the hypotheses and produce useful information about sex roles.

The Semantic Differential concept totals, for example, did not give information on responses to each item of the scale. The total score could be produced from a range of item-score combinations. In the main study, the frequency of response on items would be investigated to provide information about which masculine and feminine items were used to describe the five concepts.

Similarly, the AVL total score did not produce the information needed to judge the social desirability of the individual items. The frequencies of response for the three rating points on each item would be considered in the main study.

During the completion of the pilot study the scoring of the BSRI was changed by Bem. When the concept of androgyny was first used by Bem (1974), the androgynous person was one who showed little difference between his or her masculinity and femininity scores on the BSRI. The 't' ratio method of analysis was therefore suitable.

But Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) pointed out that the 't' ratio method obscured any potential differences between subjects who had low endorsement of masculine and feminine characteristics, and those who had high endorsement of these characteristics. They recommended dividing the scores at the median on both the masculinity and femininity scales, and then deriving a four-fold classification of subjects. Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1975) and Bem (1976) found some differences between the low-low scorers and the high-high group, which they felt was support for the new scoring method. The high-high group was thus labelled 'androgynous' and the low-low scorers as 'undifferentiated'.

It was therefore decided to investigate the responses of the population sample on the BSRI using the median-split method of analysis. The inclusion of the twenty neutral items now seemed unnecessary, and, considering the length of the battery, they were excluded from the scale. A factor analysis of the scale also seemed appropriate because, at that point, none was available for an Australian sample.

A third problem which became clear during the pilot study was that the final score on the AWS was complicated by two

factors: firstly, some questions are worded so that the type of attitude assessed is unclear, and some questions involve attitudes toward the male role which are not considered in the interpretation of responses.

The 'Sexual Behaviour' section of the scale (Spence & Helmreich, 1972, p.38) illustrates the first problem. This section appears to assess a 'moral' attitude rather than a 'woman's sex role' attitude. For example, question 7 reads: "It is all right for wives to have an occasional, casual extra-marital affair". If the respondent disagrees with this question she or he is categorised as 'traditional' or 'conservative'. The position is similar for question 1 which reads: "Women have an obligation to be faithful to their husbands". In this question agreement indicates a traditional/conservative attitude. But these questions are biased because they do not measure an attitude to the woman's position in a relationship compared to a man's position. They may be assessing a moral attitude to relationships in general.

This problem could have been overcome by the inclusion of alternative questions on the male role, for example, "It is all right for husbands to have an occasional, casual extramarital affair", or "husbands have an obligation to be faithful to their wives". If these had been included then a more accurate measurement of a conservative attitude towards women's roles would have been indicated by a response that a woman should be faithful to her husband, but that he need not be faithful to her. In their present form, these questions do not offer this

alternative and respondents may be classified as conservative in their attitude to women on invalid grounds.

The 'Drinking, Swearing and Dirty Jokes' section contains further examples of questions which may not reflect attitudes to women's social role but which may be more indicative of custom, taste or sub-culture values. The 'Dating, Courtship and Etiquette' section invites the same criticism. These questions relate to the traditional rules of etiquette and custom. It can thus be argued that they should be included because the actions represented in them imply a "helpless" position for women. However the major issues involved in the liberation of people from sex roles may be based on greater inequalities than those concerned with etiquette.

The second aspect that complicates the interpretation of the final score is that some questions assess attitudes to the male role. Question 17 is an example of this and states: "Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry". Question 31 further illustrates the point: "In general, the father should have a greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children".

The mingling of male and female roles is unavoidable in this type of scale. It represents the actual situation where male and female roles are interdependent. The inclusion of 'male role' oriented questions, then, should not negate nor detract from the value of the AWS. However, it should not be

ignored in the interpretation of the final score.

The validity of the use of the total score has also been questioned by Law (1976), who found differences between the factor structure he derived using Australian responses and those of the Spence and Helmreich study (U.S.A.).

The inclusion of male role oriented questions in the AWS raised the question of whether attitudes to the male role should be assessed in this study, as well as attitudes to the female role. It seemed that it would be appropriate because the Semantic Differential assessed attitudes toward male and female stereotypes and because of the difficulty of successfully segregating male and female role questions. Thus, specific male-role questions could be included in the AWS or a new scale could be constructed. After consideration of some of the problems with the ambiguity of questions on the AWS, the latter course was chosen and the Attitude to Sex Roles Questionnaire was designed.

2.3.1 Attitude to Sex Roles Questionnaire (ASRQ)

The ASRQ was based on questions from the AWS and from a new scale by Penman (1975) on the Present and Future Role Conceptions of Women. The Penman scale concentrated on social, political and economic roles of women, whereas the AWS had included legal and educational aspects as well. The ASRQ attempted to include questions on relationships and marriage roles, work roles, political roles, economic roles, and sexual behaviour. Some specific male role questions were designed and included, which were not in either the AWS or the Penman

scale.[5]

There were 33 questions in the scale: 11 predominantly male specific; 11 predominantly female specific and 11 combining male and female roles. [These divisions remain flexible, however, as it is very difficult to isolate questions which refer only to males or females because of the interdependent nature of these roles in society]. The ASRQ questions are shown in Appendix A, section four. The specific areas of interest covered by the questionnaire and their related question numbers are shown in Table 2. The role to which the question relates is also shown as M (male role), F (female role) or M/F (male and female role).

---

[5]The questions included from the two scales were as follows:

AWS (long form) - 4, 10, 17, 19, 21, 23, 26, 27, 34, 38, 45, 49, 54

Penman - 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 53, 55, 57

Table 2

The areas of concern of the ASRQ, with the sex role to which each question is related.

Household duties:	6(F), 9(M), 14(M)
Work roles:	2(F), 3(F), 4(F), 10(M), 12(M), 13(F), 25(F)
Children:	5(F), 26(M/F)
Divorce:	18(M/F), 22(M), 31(M/F)
Emotional support:	16(M), 21(M)
Job equality and equality of opportunity:	7(M/F), 15(F), 19(M/F), 27(M/F), 30(M/F), 32(M), 33(M/F)
Political roles:	1(F), 20(M/F), 29(M)
Economic roles:	17(M/F), 23(F), 28(M)
Sexual freedom:	8(M), 11(F), 24(M/F)

Scoring:

The ASRQ is scored in a similar manner to the AWS with four response categories: Agree Strongly, Agree Mildly, Disagree Mildly, Disagree Strongly. A score between 1 and 4 is assigned to each item, one indicating the conservative or traditional response and four indicating a liberal response.[6] A total score for each respondent can be obtained, indicating a conservative or liberal attitude to sex roles, as well as sub-total scores for the male-specific, female-specific and mixed-role questions. The scale was designed so that the conservative response is "agree strongly" on seventeen (17) questions and "disagree strongly" on sixteen (16) questions. The order of the questions was randomised.

Reliability:

A further sample of 105 undergraduate students (68 females and 37 males) was administered the ASRQ. The age range of the subjects was 18 to 50 years with a mean age of 21 years. Test-retest reliability scores obtained over a four week period indicated high reliability. For males, the total

---

[6] A conservative response is defined here as one which is traditional or stereotypic; which allocates roles and activities to people on the basis of sex. A liberal response is one which indicates a breaking away from sex role stereotypes, placing greater emphasis on individual potential. Osmond and Martin (1975) discuss a sex role continuum which would be applicable here. They note that the traditional sex roles are those based on the "polar, dichotomous conceptions of the nature and roles of men versus women". Modern roles are "characterized by flexible and dynamic transcendence of sex-role constraints; that is, 'modern' definitions of social roles are not specified by 'sex' " (p.745).

score, r = 0.87; the male role score, r = 0.69; and the female role, r = 0.77. For females, the total score, r = 0.87; male role, r = 0.81; and female role, r = 0.77.

Nunnally's coefficient alpha (Nunnally, 1967) was computed and was 0.92, indicating that the questionnaire had strong internal consistency.

The ASRQ thus appeared to be a reliable alternative to the AWS. It was shorter and eliminated some ambiguities in the AWS. It also included male-role questions and therefore was incorporated into the test battery for the main sample instead of the AWS. It was intended that the factor structure of the scale should be investigated in the main study. The hypothesis regarding roles was changed to accommodate the new scale. Thus, the hypotheses to be tested in the main study were as follows:

1. With respect to the social desirability of characteristics (Section 1.3.2):

> For men and women more masculine than feminine stereotypic characteristics are seen as socially desirable.

2. With respect to the concepts of Typical Man and Woman, Self, and Ideal Man and Woman (Section 1.3.2):

(i) Men and Women perceive the *Typical Man* and the *Typical Woman* in terms of the traditional cultural male and female stereotypes as defined by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) and in the literature by Bardwick and Douvan (1972).

(ii) Women perceive a difference between the *Typical Woman*, *Self*, and *Ideal Woman* such that the *Typical Woman* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* as less stereotypic than the *Self*.

(iii) The description by men of the *Ideal Woman* contains more traditionally masculine characteristics than

does their description of the *Typical Woman*.

(iv) Men perceive a difference between the *Typical Man*, *Self* and *Ideal Man* such that the *Typical Man* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* as less stereotypic than the *Self*.

(v) The description by women of their *Ideal Man* contains more traditionally feminine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Man*.

3. With respect to the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Section 1.3.2):

The responses on the BSRI would be investigated for an Australian sample, using the median-split method of analysis. Factor analysis would also be carried out.

4. With respect to roles (Section 1.3.3):

Women are more liberal in their attitudes toward sex roles than are men.

Chapter Three Main Study (Population sample):

Method

3.1 Sampling procedure

3.2 Procedure followed by data collectors.

3.3 Subjects

Method

The test battery, developed in the pilot study, was administered to a sample of the Australian population in order to test the hypotheses which arose from a discussion of the sex-role stereotype literature (see Section 1.5 and the end of Chapter Two).

3.1 Sampling procedure

The sampling technique used was multi-stage sampling. Moser and Kalton (1971) have outlined the various methods of sampling. The multi-stage method was chosen because it was more feasible than a random sample of the electoral roll (for Cunningham, New South Wales) but still contained the principles of random or probability sampling.

In multi-stage sampling, the population is regarded as being composed of first stage or primary sampling units (PSU). Each of these contains a second stage unit and so on. A random sample is taken of the first stage units, then of the second stage units, continuing down to the final unit. Sampling, therefore, is random at each stage.

The PSU's of this sample were the Collector Districts of the Wollongong area of New South Wales, Australia, used by the Australian Bureau of Census and Statistics. These collector districts had been rated previously on a five point scale with respect to socio-economic class.[7] The lowest socio-economic

---

[7] This grading had been conducted by Dr Ross Robinson, Geography Department, University of Wollongong, N.S.W., Australia.

group was eliminated from the study because it contained large migrant populations, and the study aimed to question an English-speaking Australian population if possible. The four remaining rating points could be labelled lower middle class, middle class, upper middle class and upper class.

Each of these socio-economic groups included between 20 and 37 collector districts. A random sample of two collector districts was chosen for each group. Maps of these districts were then overlaid with a grid and one of the grid squares was randomly selected. Within this area the streets were randomly sampled and three streets per collector district were selected. In these streets door-to-door interviews were conducted.

3.2 Procedure followed by data collectors

A team of four data collectors was involved in the collection of the data. These were all women (there were no men available) who had had experience in survey work. One of the women had a long association with University research projects as well as with a number of government surveys and was in charge of the group.

A number of experienced collectors was needed because of the time that the test battery took to complete (up to one hour). Moser and Kalton (1971) have commented that the response rate in surveys depends on the purpose of the survey, on the interviewers and on the general approach. Durbin and Stuart (1951) found in an experiment that professional

individuals had a three to four percent refusal rate compared to the inexperienced individual's thirteen percent. In fact, the refusal rate in the present study was much higher: twenty percent. There were also eighty people who could not be contacted on second call-back and four forms were discarded because they were filled-in incorrectly.

Moser and Stuart (1953) also comment that there are certain sections of the population which may be more difficult than others to interview. They found in an experimental survey that the refusal rate was higher for females than for males (8.9% to 6.1%). Furthermore, socio-economic class made a difference, with the upper class refusal rate highest (12.2%), middle-class second highest (9.7%) and lower class the least (6.3%). In the present study data collectors found it more difficult to obtain data from the upper class areas. However, they found it more difficult to obtain male rather than female subjects. This may be a result of the fact that the study was related to sex roles.

The interviewers were allocated a specific number of completed questionnaires which they had to collect in each street, usually eleven or twelve. A sample of three hundred was aimed for. As completed test batteries were collected they were grouped according to the sex, marital status and age of the respondents, and interviewers attempted to obtain an even distribution across these variables. Initially, the data collectors were asked to

limit their calls to sixteen or seventeen houses per street. However, it proved difficult to obtain the number of completed test batteries needed within that limitation and they finally called at as many houses as were necessary to obtain their quota for the street. They also interviewed only English-speaking subjects in order to select an Australian sample.

The data collectors carried an identification card from the University with them and explained to subjects that they were participating in a survey of attitudes about men and women. There were further instructions on the test battery itself (see Appendix A). The collector remained with the respondent while he or she completed the battery.

The collectors were instructed not to administer a test battery to more than one person per house or flat, so that two family members or husband and wife pairs were not questioned. Although no names were recorded on the questionnaires, the address and/or phone number of each respondent was noted on a separate sheet of paper after they had completed the battery so that random checks on the collectors could be made. Respondents were unaware of this unless subsequently contacted and their test battery was not marked in any way. The information collected thus remained confidential and anonymous.

3.3 Subjects

The subjects were 148 females and 154 males from the Wollongong area of New South Wales, Australia. The questionnaire administered to the subjects asked for some

biographical details (see Appendix A). Table 3 shows the responses to these questions. The percentage of subjects in the sub-categories for each of the following variables are shown:

> Age, marital status, level of education reached, socio-economic grade of occupation and of partner's occupation (when applicable), the social class which the respondent feels her or his attitudes are similar to (class similarity), nationality, and the nationality of the subject's mother and father.

For each category there were some 'no response' figures but these have only been tabulated for the partner's occupation question. For this question, non-response indicates non-married status.

Interviewers had attempted to obtain an even distribution over age but the older age groups were under-represented. The majority of people were or had been married.

Most men had occupations in the middle and working classes (76%) and most women were occupied with home duties (62.8%). Of the males who had partners (63%), 38.3 percent had wives occupied with home duties and 24.7 percent had working wives. Most women (54.7%) felt their attitudes were most akin to middle class attitudes, while the men were divided between middle class and working class attitudes.

Although most respondents were Australian-born (61.7% of males, 71% of females) about one third were not. The nationality of respondents who were not Australian-born was not recorded. The nationality of the respondents' parents was fairly evenly divided between Australian and non-Australian born people.

This sample of the population was administered the test battery described in Chapter Two and detailed in Appendix A. The results and discussion for each section of the battery are presented in Chapters Four, Five and Six.

Table 3

Biographical details of the Australian population sample (F = 148, M = 154)

	Males %	Females %
Age		
18 - 24	22.7	23.0
25 - 34	22.1	21.6
35 - 44	18.2	17.6
45 - 54	17.5	18.9
55 - 64	11.0	12.2
65 & over	8.4	6.1
Marital Status		
Married	57.1	70.9
Single	24.0	19.6
Divorced	5.2	4.1
Separated	2.6	1.4
Remarried	6.5	2.7
Cohabiting	3.9	0.7
Level of education		
Primary	14.3	2.0
Lower Secondary	45.5	58.1
Upper Secondary	10.3	17.5
Technical college	17.5	10.8
University	5.8	4.7
Post-graduate	-	1.4
Other	1.3	2.7
†**Socio-economic grade of occupation**		
Home duties	*4.5	62.8
Upper class	16.2	3.4
Middle class	41.6	17.6
Lower class	34.4	12.2
†**Socio-economic grade of partner's occupation (where applicable)**		
Home duties	38.3	-
Upper class	3.3	6.8
Middle class	9.1	35.8
Lower class	12.3	28.4
(No response)	35.7	13.5
Class similarity		
Upper class	-	0.7
Middle class	39.0	54.7
Lower middle class	15.6	16.9
Working class	41.6	25.0
Nationality		
Australian-born	61.7	71.0
Not Australian-born	38.3	27.0
Mother's nationality		
Australian-born	53.3	62.2
Not Australian-born	46.8	35.8
Father's nationality		
Australian-born	48.7	60.1
Not Australian-born	50.7	37.8

* May include retired or unemployed men.
† According to Congalton (1969).

Chapter Four Results and Discussion : Adjective Value List and Semantic Differential (Hypotheses 1 and 2)

4.1 Results: Adjective Value List (AVL)

These results relate to hypothesis 1 which concerns the social desirability of characteristics:

> For men and women more masculine than feminine stereotypic characteristics are seen as socially desirable.

The adjectives on the AVL were rated as 'desirable', 'undesirable' or 'neither' for a mature adult irrespective of sex. Table 4 presents the results obtained from analysis of these rating points for males and females. An indication is also given of whether the item was traditionally masculine or feminine (M or F) and socially desirable or undesirable (D or U) according to Broverman (1970).

The only items which showed a significant sex difference across the three rating points using Chi-square were 'unassertive' ($p=0.01$) and 'easily expresses tender feelings' ($p=0.001$).

The items in Table 4 which failed to differentiate across the three rating points were 'unaggressive' and 'dominant' for both males and females. Responses for the item 'a leader' failed to show a significant difference between the 'desirable' and 'undesirable' rating points for both sexes. This was also true of 'home-oriented' for the male sample.

Table 4

Items from the Adjective Value List are presented showing the percentage of males and females (italicised) who rated each item as socially desirable, socially undesirable or neither. Each item is marked M (Masculine) or F (Feminine) to show its stereotypic orientation and D or U to indicate whether the item was desirable or undesirable according to Broverman (1970).

	Item	Socially Desirable		Socially Undesirable		Neither	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
MD	Consistent	91.6	*93.9*	7.1	*3.4*	1.3	*2.7*
MD	Strong personality	85.1	*85.8*	4.5	*4.1*	10.4	*9.5*
MD	Active	93.5	*95.3*	3.2	*2.0*	3.2	*2.7*
MD	Intelligent	94.8	*95.3*	1.3	*0.7*	3.9	*2.7*
MD	Objective	70.1	*81.8*	13.0	*10.8*	14.9	*6.1*
MD	Realistic	98.1	*98.0*	0.6	*2.0*	1.3	-
MD	Adventurous	79.9	*82.4*	3.9	*2.7*	13.6	*14.9*
MD	Unemotional	11.0	*6.1*	71.4	*81.1*	16.9	*12.8*
MD	Competitive	76.0	*70.3*	9.7	*8.1*	13.6	*20.9*
MD	Independent	76.6	*85.1*	7.8	*5.4*	13.6	*6.8*
MD	Practical	92.9	*98.6*	3.9	*0.7*	2.6	-
MD	Dominant	30.5	*28.4*	36.4	*27.0*	32.5	*43.9*
MD	Competent	94.2	*92.6*	2.6	*3.4*	1.3	*2.7*
MD	A leader	52.6	*49.3*	13.6	*10.1*	33.8	*39.9*
FD	Gentle	87.7	*90.5*	5.8	*2.0*	6.5	*7.4*
FD	Easily expresses tender feelings	72.1	*89.2*	12.3	*2.0*	15.6	*8.8*
FD	Warm	86.4	*95.3*	3.2	-	8.4	*4.1*
FD	Home-oriented	53.2	*66.2*	13.0	*8.1*	33.8	*25.7*
FU	Unassertive	19.5	*11.5*	51.9	*70.9*	27.9	*17.6*
FU	Unself-confident	11.7	*8.8*	77.9	*83.1*	8.4	*6.8*
FU	Unambitious	8.4	*9.5*	76.6	*77.7*	14.3	*12.8*
FU	Insecure	4.5	*2.0*	83.1	*92.6*	9.1	*5.4*
FU	Unaggressive	37.0	*38.5*	41.6	*37.8*	20.8	*23.6*
FU	Illogical	9.7	*7.4*	78.6	*83.8*	9.7	*8.1*
FU	Easily influenced	1.9	*2.7*	79.2	*85.8*	16.2	*10.8*
FU	Irrational	7.1	*4.7*	76.6	*87.2*	14.3	*7.4*

4.2 Discussion : Adjective Value List

As the results in Table 4 indicate, 14 adjectives were rated as socially desirable. These were:

M	Consistent	M	Realistic
M	Strong personality	M	Adventurous
M	Active	M	Competitive
M	Intelligent	M	Independent
M	Objective	M	Practical
M	Competent	F	Gentle
F	Warm	F	Easily expresses tender feelings

Eleven of these items are traditionally positive masculine adjectives. Three of them are feminine characteristics which are also traditionally positive or socially desirable (Deaux, 1976). The desirable characteristics for a mature adult are, therefore, those which define an active, independent but expressive person.

These items were also found by Broverman and her colleagues (1970) to be rated as socially desirable for "an adult sex unspecified" by college students (40 men and 41 women).

The characteristics which were described as socially undesirable were:

M	Unemotional	F	Unassertive
F	Unself-confident	F	Illogical
F	Unambitious	F	Easily influenced
F	Insecure	F	Irrational

With the exception of 'unemotional' these were all traditionally feminine characteristics. The hypothesis that for men and women more masculine than feminine characteristics are seen as socially desirable was therefore supported.

Broverman (1970) had found that the bi-polar opposites of these undesirable characteristics were socially desirable, so

the result was not unexpected. Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) also point out that masculinity is more greatly valued because more male than female traits are positively valued. But it would be incorrect to assume that these characteristics, which were rated as undesirable for an 'adult', would necessarily be desirable for a 'woman'. Deaux (1976) points out that both stereotypes have positive and negative elements. Men are described with a positive competency cluster and women with a positive expressiveness cluster. The items above may have been negative in the female stereotype.

It should be noted, too, that the feminine items on the AVL appear as skewed toward the negative and this was reinforced by the use of negative prefixes.

The characteristics which failed to differentiate across the three rating points for males and females were 'dominant' and 'unaggressive'. This lack of consensus about the desirability of these two items may reflect a change in the desirability of 'hard' masculine items. Broverman (1970) found 'dominant' and 'aggressive' to be socially desirable items. The time-lapse between the Broverman study and the present study may indicate that attitudes have changed with respect to these characteristics. Alternatively, the difference may be cultural as the Broverman sample was North American.

The result did not, however, indicate that it is now desirable to be 'unaggressive' or undesirable to be 'dominant'. Furthermore, the results cannot be construed as indicating that the items were no longer relevant to the conception of

the mature adult, as greater support for the 'neither' category may have shown.

For both males and females, responses to the item 'a leader' showed no significant difference between the 'desirable' and 'undesirable' poles. This was also true of 'home-oriented' for the male sample, but females rated it as desirable. In the Broverman study, however, 'a leader' was rated as socially desirable as was 'worldly' (as opposed to 'home-oriented').

The results in general were similar to the Broverman results with subjects rating active and expressive items as desirable. The differences between the two studies may be interpreted as a gradual changing of what society views as desirable and acceptable. With the increasing emphasis on equality between the sexes it would be expected that the extreme and more autocratic items like 'dominant' and 'aggressive' would be becoming less desirable personality characteristics. There is some evidence of this change. Der-Karabetian and Smith's (1977) finding that their female subjects rated feminine attributes more positively than masculine attributes was not supported in this study. But this may be a reflection of the items used and of the limitations of the scale in the present study which will be discussed in Section 4.9.

4.3 Results and Discussion : Semantic Differential

The results and discussion in the following sections relate to the five sub-hypotheses of hypothesis 2. The results and discussion for each sub-hypothesis will be considered independently.

The results for each sub-hypothesis were analysed in the following way. Frequency distributions were obtained for the 26 adjectives on each of the five Semantic Differential concepts - *Typical Woman, Typical Man, Self, Ideal Woman,* and *Ideal Man* - for males and females separately. To determine if any adjective of each bi-polar item was definitive of a particular concept, the rating columns 1-3 and 5-7 were collapsed and a one-variable Chi-square was computed. This was calculated on the frequencies of the two poles in most cases, because the frequencies at the 'neither' category (4) were small for most items. If the responses for the 'neither' category were close to the responses for one of the poles (and 20% or above), a Chi-square was computed across the three points. (Each Table of results will indicate if this occurred for any item.) The adjectives which obtained significant frequencies at one pole thus defined the five concepts.

4.4 Results *Sub-hypothesis*:

> Men and Women perceive the *Typical Man* and the *Typical Woman* in terms of the traditional cultural male and female stereotypes as defined by Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) and by Bardwick and Douvan (1972).

Tables 5 and 6 present the adjectives which were significantly rated (using Chi-square, $p \leq .01$) as descriptive of the *Typical Woman* and the *Typical Man*, for both female and male respondents. The percentage of respondents rating each adjective are indicated.

Table 5

The adjectives which were significantly ($p \leq 0.01$) rated as descriptive of the *Typical Woman* by women and men are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	Women	Men
M	Practical	74.3	63.0
M	Active	65.5	69.5
M	Realistic	77.7	63.6
M	Ambitious	60.8	64.3
M	Assertive	56.7	51.2
M	Strong personality	58.7	68.2
M	Competent	81.7	77.3
M	Competitive	60.8	53.3
M	Self-confident	64.9	62.3
M	Logical	69.6	64.3
M	Intelligent	82.4	79.2
M	Rational	59.5	-
M	Objective	52.0	-
M	Consistent	63.5	-
F	Easily expresses tender feelings	77.0	84.4
F	Warm	87.1	77.9
F	Gentle	84.5	83.8
F	Emotional	87.1	85.8
F	Dependent	62.9	64.3
F	Home-oriented	72.3	71.5
F	Submissive	52.0	55.2
F	A follower	51.4	60.3

Table 6

The adjectives which were significantly ($p \leq 0.01$) rated as descriptive of the *Typical Man* by women and men are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	Women	Men
M	Practical	63.5	74.7
M	Active	71.6	72.1
M	Realistic	63.5	73.3
M	Ambitious	68.2	69.5
M	Rational	61.5	70.1
M	Assertive	64.1	57.1
M	Secure	62.1	70.2
M	Strong personality	69.6	64.9
M	Competent	70.3	75.9
M	Objective	51.4	56.5
M	Competitive	66.9	74.0
M	Self-confident	75.6	76.0
M	Logical	60.2	73.3
M	Adventurous	67.6	73.4
M	Dominant	69.5	62.4
M	Consistent	55.5	61.1
M	Intelligent	77.7	77.3
M	Aggressive	64.2	66.9
M	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings	-	54.5
F	Warm	70.9	53.2
F	Emotional	52.6	54.5

4.4.1 Discussion

The results in Tables 5 and 6 indicate that the hypothesis was not supported. Men and women did not perceive the *Typical Woman* in terms of the traditional stereotype. However, the *Typical Man* was described in general as stereotypically masculine, though both male and female descriptions did include two feminine items.

So although a number of previous studies (for example, Sherriffs and Jarrett, 1953; Broverman et al., 1972) had found the stereotype to be clearly defined and uncritically accepted, the definitions obtained in the present study were not as stereotyped as the literature had implied they would be.

The results in Table 5, for the *Typical Woman*, show remarkable similarity between the male and female descriptions and this has been a consistent finding in the literature (Broverman et al., 1972; Frieze et al., 1978; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Williams & Bennett, 1975). The only difference between the two descriptions lay in the exclusion from the male list of three masculine adjectives. Woman rated 14 masculine and 8 feminine items as descriptive, while the men rated 11 masculine and 8 feminine items as descriptive.

The masculine items included in the descriptions were socially desirable. Half the feminine items were socially desirable - warm, gentle, easily expresses tender feelings, emotional - but the items 'dependent', 'a follower', 'home-oriented' and 'submissive', were items which were not clearly

socially desirable on the AVL. 'Home-oriented' was seen as socially desirable by women, but there was no consensus on its desirability by men. The item 'independent' was rated as socially desirable so 'dependent' may have been seen as undesirable. Although their bi-polar opposites were used in the AVL, results indicated that the items 'a follower' and 'submissive' would be neither accepted nor rejected as socially desirable. There were, then, some items in the *Typical Woman* description whose social desirability was questionable.

The results of the present study differ from those of Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) in that the North American study resulted in a stereotypic description. In that study the subjects were asked to "Imagine that you are going to meet someone for the first time and the only thing that you know in advance is that she/he is an adult female/male". The Stereotype Questionnaire, from which the Semantic Differential items for the present study were taken, was used.

One reason for the difference in results may lie in the sample differences. Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) tested American college students while the present study questioned an Australian population sample. It is possible that the student samples knew what was "expected" by the researcher when they were asked to describe the "adult" man or woman, that is, the stereotypic description. The Australian population sample may have been more naive. These people may in fact not view the typical woman as stereotypic, as the data suggest. However,

there are a number of alternative reasons for these results, including methodological problems, which will be discussed in Section 4.9.

The descriptions of the *Typical Man* shown in Table 6 were also similar for both sexes, and were traditionally masculine. Men included 19 masculine and 2 feminine items in their description, while the women rated 18 masculine and 2 feminine items. Both feminine items were the same - 'warm' and 'emotional'.

Not all the masculine characteristics ascribed to the *Typical Man* were favourable. Both men and women described him as 'dominant' and 'aggressive', yet on the AVL these items had failed to differentiate as desirable, undesirable or neither for both groups.

An interesting aspect of the *Typical Man* description was that a significant number of men included the item 'uneasy when expressing tender feelings'. The 'easily expresses tender feelings' pole on the AVL was rated as socially desirable, so this Semantic Differential result indicates that men see a limit to the *Typical Man's* emotionality. Although warm and emotional, he is uneasy about expressing tender feelings.

There were a number of items for which neither pole was significantly rated as descriptive of the *Typical Man*. Both men and women had similar percentages of subjects rating the *Typical Man* as 'easily influenced' and 'not easily influenced'. They were also divided on 'independent/dependent' which is

surprising as it was expected that 'independent' would be clearly chosen (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). Both were also divided on whether the *Typical Man* is gentle or rough and home-oriented or worldly. The 'gentle/rough' item for men had a strong percentage (20.8%) rating the 'neither' category, indicating that for these men the item may not be related to their perception of the *Typical Man*. The 'home-oriented/worldly' item divided both men and women and may indicate that men are perceived as more 'home-oriented' than would be expected.

The item 'a leader/a follower' produced a division in both groups - for the women the division was between leader/neither/follower and for the men it was between the two poles. This may be reflecting the division over the social desirability of this item.

In comparison with the description of the *Typical Woman*, the *Typical Man* was seen to be more traditionally masculine oriented with a greater number of masculine characteristics and fewer feminine characteristics. There was, though, a core of shared characteristics. The *Typical Man* was more in accord with the stereotype than the *Typical Woman*, but this may have been influenced by the more negative orientation of the feminine characteristics on the Semantic Differential and the general desirability of masculine characteristics (expanded in Section 4.9).

4.5 Results *Sub-hypothesis*:

> Women perceive a difference between the *Typical Woman*, *Self*, and *Ideal Woman* such that the *Typical Woman* is

described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* as less stereotypic than the *Self*.

Table 7 presents the adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by women as descriptive of the *Typical Woman*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman*, while Table 8 presents the Semantic Differential items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by women as descriptive for one or more of the three concepts, *Typical Woman*, *Self*, and *Ideal Woman*. The percentage of responses at each pole are indicated, and the percentage of responses for the 'neither' category on the two items, 'a leader/a follower' and 'dominant/submissive', are also shown. Poles which were significantly rated as descriptive are indicated with an asterix.

Table 7

The adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by women as descriptive of the *Typical Woman*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	*Typical Woman*	*Self*	*Ideal Woman*
M	Practical	74.3	85.1	91.9
M	Active	65.5	77.7	89.8
M	Realistic	77.7	81.0	92.6
M	Ambitious	60.8	73.0	88.5
M	Rational	59.5	78.3	89.9
M	Assertive	56.7	65.6	72.9
M	Strong personality	58.7	76.4	92.6
M	Competent	81.7	88.5	92.6
M	Objective	52.0	66.2	67.5
M	Competitive	60.8	54.7	78.4
M	Self-confident	64.9	67.5	92.6
M	Logical	69.6	85.1	93.9
M	Consistent	63.5	76.9	93.3
M	Intelligent	82.4	91.2	97.2
M	Not easily influenced	-	60.8	82.5
M	Secure	-	73.6	93.8
M	Adventurous	-	63.4	83.1
M	Independent	-	-	57.4
M	A leader	-	-	52.1
F	Easily expresses tender feelings	77.0	72.2	95.2
F	Warm	87.1	85.2	93.3
F	Gentle	84.5	83.9	90.5
F	Emotional	87.1	86.5	85.1
F	Dependent	62.9	-	-
F	Submissive	52.0	-	-
F	A follower	51.4	-	-
F	Home-oriented	72.3	58.8	-

Table 8

Items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by women as descriptive for one or more of the three concepts *Typical Woman*, *Self*, and *Ideal Woman*, are shown. The percentage of women rating each adjective, and in two cases the 'neither' category, are indicated. M or F denote the masculinity or femininity of the adjective.

	Item	*Typical Woman*	*Self*	*Ideal Woman*
F	Easily influenced	53.4	29.1	7.4
M	Not easily influenced	37.8	*60.8	*82.5
M	Secure	53.4	*73.6	*93.8
F	Insecure	37.9	21.0	2.8
F	Dependent	*62.9	39.9	36.5
M	Independent	31.8	54.7	*57.4
M	Aggressive	43.9	44.0	43.2
F	Unaggressive	39.9	42.5	42.6
M	†Leader	22.2	37.8	*52.1
	Neither	24.3	27.0	24.3
F	Follower	*51.4	33.8	20.3
F	Home-oriented	*72.3	*58.8	49.4
M	Worldly	19.7	24.3	36.6
M	Adventurous	52.0	*63.4	*83.1
F	Unadventurous	36.6	28.4	9.2
M	†Dominant	27.7	38.5	35.1
	Neither	19.6	27.7	33.8
F	Submissive	*52.0	33.8	29.1

* These poles obtained significant percentages of responses (Chi-square, $p \leq 0.01$).

† Chi-square was computed across the three points for these items.

4.5.1 Discussion

The sub-hypothesis that women would perceive a difference between the *Typical Woman*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* such that the *Typical Woman* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Woman* as less stereotypic than the *Self*, was supported. However, none of the concepts could be labelled as stereotypically feminine in that they were all described with a majority of masculine adjectives.

Table 7 indicates that 18 items were used consistently by a significant number of the female sample to describe all three concepts - the *Typical Woman*, the *Self* and the *Ideal Woman*. In most cases support for these adjectives increased across the three concepts so that the *Ideal Woman* was quite strongly defined with most adjectives having over 90 percent of subjects rating them as descriptive.

The most notable aspect about the three concept descriptions was the increased inclusion of masculine items from *Typical Woman* to *Self* to *Ideal Woman*. The *Typical Woman* description contains 14 masculine and 8 feminine adjectives; the *Self* description contains 17 masculine and 5 feminine items, having lost 'dependent' and 'submissive', and the *Ideal Woman* description has 19 masculine and 4 feminine items, dropping 'home-oriented'. The *Ideal Woman* was accorded a very masculine-oriented description.

The items in Table 8 are those for which there was no significant differentiation of responses between the two poles for one or more of the concepts. For six of these

items, support for one of the poles changed across the three concepts. On three of these - 'easily/not easily influenced', 'adventurous/unadventurous' and 'secure/insecure' - respondents failed to differentiate significantly between the two poles for *Typical Woman*. Support for the masculine pole was significant in the *Self* description and this support was stronger for the *Ideal Woman* description. The *Ideal Woman* was thus: not easily influenced, adventurous and secure. These changes correspond with the social desirability ratings which indicated that it is not socially desirable to be easily influenced or insecure and it is desirable to be adventurous.

The items 'dependent/independent', 'home-oriented/worldly' and 'a leader/a follower' were also items for which support changed between the three concepts. The *Typical Woman* was rated as 'dependent' but there was no significant difference between the poles for the *Self* description. The *Ideal Woman* was described as 'independent' so again there was a change toward the masculine pole, also rated as desirable on the AVL.

The item 'home-oriented/worldly' produced an interesting result because of the decreasing percentage of women rating 'home-oriented' as descriptive across the three concepts. The *Typical Woman* was described as home-oriented and this was also rated by women as a desirable characteristic. The *Self* description was also 'home-oriented' but the percentage rating the item had dropped from 72.3 percent (*Typical Woman*) to

58.8 percent. For the *Ideal Woman* there was no significant differentiation between the two poles. The social desirability figures for this item (Table 4) show that, although it was rated as 'desirable' by a significant proportion of respondents, (66.2%), 33.8 percent rated it as either undesirable (25.7%) or neither desirable nor undesirable (8.1%). This 33.8 percent may correspond with the 36.6 percent who rated their *Ideal Woman* as 'worldly'. However, it should be noted that 'worldly' was not assessed for social desirability and this assumed connection may be unwarranted.

The item 'a leader/a follower' also showed a change of poles from the description of the *Typical Woman* as 'a follower' to the *Ideal Woman*, rated as 'a leader'. This item is different though because of the high percentage of respondents in the 'neither' category (and therefore Chi-square was computed across the three rating points). For both the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman* there were almost equal percentages of women rating the 'neither' category and the non-significant pole ('leader' for *Typical Woman* and 'follower' for *Ideal Woman*). The *Self* concept data showed no significant difference over the three rating points, with respondents rating equally leader/neither/follower. This is, therefore, an item on which there is some division in the sample and it may be related to the social desirability of the item. On the AVL the female responses showed no significant difference between the 'desirable' and 'undesirable' poles for the item 'a leader'. The division in the sample may be related also to life-experience.

For some women the position of leader may not be part of the framework of their socialized perceptions of self and other women.

The final two items in Table 8 are those for which the responses were not polarized strongly, that is, 'aggressive/unaggressive' and 'dominant/submissive'.

The item 'aggressive/unaggressive' did not change between the three concepts. On each concept the women's responses were evenly divided between the two poles. This result may reflect not only a division in the sample over perceptions of the *Typical Woman*, the *Self* and the *Ideal Woman* as aggressive or unaggressive, but an uncertainty about the desirability of the characteristic 'aggression'. Results on the AVL (Table 4) show an even distribution over the three rating points - desirable, undesirable and neither. As previously indicated, this is a different result from the Broverman (1970) finding of 'aggressive' as socially desirable. It is possible that because of the encouragement being given to women to be 'assertive' (Wilson, 1975), being 'aggressive' now has dubious desirability. The data for the AVL show that 'unassertive' is rated as socially undesirable. 'Assertive' was used in all three concept descriptions by women.

The final item which did not polarize the women's responses strongly was 'dominant/submissive'. The *Typical Woman* was clearly 'submissive'. But for the *Self* and the *Ideal Woman*, responses were very similar and were evenly

distributed over the three categories - dominant/neither/ submissive. These results may indicate a similar ambivalence about the relevance or desirability of 'dominance' as was found for 'aggression'. It is interesting then to consider that 27.7 percent and 33.8 percent felt the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman* (respectively) to be *neither* dominant nor submissive. This is reflected again in the social desirability ratings where 43.9 percent rated 'dominant' as neither desirable nor undesirable. Although 27 percent also rated 'dominant' as undesirable, it is still surprising that so many women rated their *Ideal Woman* as submissive (29.1%) when they had the alternative of the 'neither' category. So although a third of the women saw their *Ideal Woman* to be neither dominant nor submissive, one third still saw their ideal as submissive and another third rated her as dominant.

In general then, the description of the *Typical Woman* was less stereotyped than was suggested in the literature (Rosenkrantz et al., 1968; Frieze et al., 1978). The *Self* emerged as a little more masculine-oriented. The *Ideal Woman* had a very positive masculine-oriented description, although the positive feminine items which were included gave it an expressive component. The *Ideal Woman* appeared as a competent, active, independent and expressive person.

4.6 Results *Sub-hypothesis:*

> The description by men of the *Ideal Woman* contains more traditionally masculine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Woman*.

Table 9 presents the adjectives which were significantly

rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive of the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman*, with their percentage of responses.

Table 10 indicates the Semantic Differential items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive for either of the two concepts or for both. Two items which gained large percentages of responses in the 'neither' category are also shown. The percentage of responses for each adjective is shown and the masculinity or femininity of each item (in both Tables) is indicated. The item 'Submissive/neither/Dominant' obtained such a strong 'neither' response (29.2%) that Chi-square was computed across all three rating points. As Table 10 indicates, 'submissive' was still the pole with the significant percentage of responses.

Table 9

The adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive of the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman* are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	*Typical Woman*	*Ideal Woman*
M	Practical	63.0	91.5
M	Active	69.5	71.4
M	Realistic	63.6	89.7
M	Ambitious	64.3	78.5
M	Assertive	51.2	55.2
M	Strong personality	68.2	82.5
M	Competent	77.3	90.3
M	Competitive	53.3	77.9
M	Self-confident	62.3	87.7
M	Logical	64.3	89.7
M	Intelligent	79.2	93.5
M	Not easily influenced	-	61.0
M	Rational	-	79.3
M	Secure	-	87.1
M	Objective	-	57.8
M	Adventurous	-	79.3
M	Consistent	-	92.2
F	Easily expresses tender feelings	84.4	93.4
F	Warm	77.9	90.9
F	Gentle	83.8	90.8
F	Emotional	85.8	85.1
F	Home-oriented	71.5	57.8
F	Submissive	55.2	46.7
F	Dependent	64.3	-
F	A follower	60.3	-

Table 10

Items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive for either the *Typical Woman*, the *Ideal Woman* or both concepts, are shown. Two items with large percentages of responses in the 'neither' category are also included, as well as the masculinity (M) or femininity (F) of the adjectives.

Item	*Typical Woman*	*Ideal Woman*
M Aggressive	43.5	38.3
F Unaggressive	39.0	45.5
F Easily influenced	52.6	24.6
M Not easily influenced	34.3	*61.0
M Rational	50.7	*79.3
F Irrational	35.7	8.4
M Secure	53.2	*87.1
F Insecure	41.5	7.7
F Dependent	*64.3	52.0
M Independent	29.8	38.9
F A follower	*60.3	38.9
Neither	20.1	19.5
M A leader	16.2	38.3
M Objective	50.7	*57.8
F Subjective	37.4	20.7
M Adventurous	43.5	*79.3
F Unadventurous	41.5	11.0
F Submissive	*55.2	†*46.7
Neither	16.2	29.2
M Dominant	27.2	23.4
M Consistent	51.9	*92.2
F Inconsistent	41.6	1.9

* These poles obtained significant percentages of responses (Chi-square, at $p \leq 0.01$).

† Chi-square was computed across the three rating points on this item for *Ideal Woman*.

4.6.1 Discussion

The sub-hypothesis that the description by men of the *Ideal Woman* contains more traditionally masculine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Woman* was supported. As Table 9 shows, the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman* descriptions had 11 masculine and 6 feminine adjectives in common. However, the *Typical Woman* concept had in addition 2 feminine characteristics, while the *Ideal Woman* description included 6 additional masculine characteristics.

The *Ideal Woman* description was thus masculine-oriented but it did contain four positive feminine characteristics. The fifth feminine characteristic, 'home-oriented', was not rated as socially desirable by men on the AVL. However, only 57.8 percent chose this pole for the *Ideal Woman* description, while 33 percent described the *Ideal Woman* as 'worldly'. Furthermore, there was a large difference between the percentage of people rating the *Typical Woman* as 'home-oriented' (71.5%) and the percentage rating the *Ideal Woman* as 'home-oriented' (57.8%). This may reflect a change in the value men place on the characteristic 'home-oriented' for women.

Both Tables 9 and 10 also indicate that on 6 items responses did not significantly favour either of the poles for the *Typical Woman*, but the masculine pole became descriptive of the *Ideal Woman*. She is thus, 'not easily influenced', 'rational', 'secure', 'objective', 'adventurous' and 'consistent'.

However, the *Ideal Woman* and the *Typical Woman* were both

described as 'submissive'. But the results for the *Ideal Woman* show that the 'neither' category received a large percentage of the responses (29.2%). In fact, the 'neither' and 'dominant' points received similar numbers of responses. This pattern of responses may indicate an uncertainty about the social desirability of these characteristics. It is supported by the result on the AVL which indicated similar percentages of responses on the three points, 'socially desirable', 'undesirable' and 'neither'.

Men rated the *Typical Woman* as 'dependent', but that pole had fewer responses for the *Ideal Woman*. The 'independent' pole showed an increase in responses from the *Typical Woman* (29.8%) to the *Ideal Woman* (38.9%), but the *Ideal Woman* was not described as 'independent'. In light of the fact that 76.6% of males rated 'independent' as a socially desirable characteristic for a mature adult, it is difficult to know whether to interpret the change in the percentage between the *Typical Woman* and the *Ideal Woman* as an encouraging result, or the lack of differentiation of the *Ideal Woman* as 'independent' as a discouraging result.

A similar result was found on the item 'a follower/a leader'. The *Typical Woman* was described as 'a follower' (60.3%). But the results for the *Ideal Woman* showed a notable change, as 'a follower' obtained fewer responses (38.9%) and 'a leader' increased its percentage (38.3%). There was no significant difference between responses on these two poles for the *Ideal Woman*. This result may be a reflection of the

division over the social desirability of 'a follower/a leader' (see Table 4).

The *Ideal Woman* described by men was therefore more masculine in orientation than the *Typical Woman*. She was portrayed as an active, competent but expressive person. This may, however, be a reflection of the items used in the Semantic Differential, which will be discussed in Section 4.9.

4.7 Results *Sub-hypothesis:*

> Men perceive a difference between the *Typical Man*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* such that the *Typical Man* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* as less stereotypic than the *Self*.

Table 11 presents the adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive of the *Typical Man*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man*.

Table 12 shows the items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by men as descriptive for one or more of the three Semantic Differential concepts. The relevant percentages are shown as well as the masculinity or femininity of each adjective (Broverman, 1970). The percentage of men rating the 'neither' category for the 'leader/follower' item (*Self*) and for the 'gentle/rough' item (*Typical Man*) are indicated because they were above 20 percent.

Table 11

The adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by men as descriptive of the *Typical Man*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	*Typical Man*	*Self*	*Ideal Man*
M	Practical	74.7	90.3	89.6
M	Aggressive	66.9	58.5	64.3
M	Active	72.1	83.1	88.2
M	Realistic	73.3	88.3	87.7
M	Ambitious	69.5	72.7	84.4
M	Rational	70.1	81.8	81.9
M	Assertive	57.1	65.6	66.3
M	Secure	70.2	82.5	96.1
M	Strong personality	64.9	83.8	94.8
M	Competent	75.9	90.9	92.8
M	Objective	56.5	71.4	70.1
M	Competitive	74.0	77.9	84.4
M	Self-confident	76.0	85.1	88.9
M	Logical	73.3	91.5	95.4
M	Adventurous	73.4	79.2	88.3
M	Dominant	62.4	61.6	68.8
M	Consistent	61.1	75.3	90.9
M	Intelligent	77.3	95.5	96.1
M	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings	54.5	-	-
M	Not easily influenced	-	67.5	85.1
M	Independent	-	62.3	61.7
M	A leader	-	59.1	74.6
M	Worldly	-	-	58.4
F	Warm	53.2	78.6	77.3
F	Emotional	54.5	71.5	63.0
F	Easily expresses tender feelings	-	63.0	76.0
F	Gentle	-	60.4	63.0

Table 12

Items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by men as descriptive for one or more of the three concepts, *Typical Man*, *Self*, and *Ideal Man*, are shown. The percentage of men rating each adjective is also indicated. M or F denote the masculinity or femininity of the adjective.

Item	*Typical Man*	*Self*	*Ideal Man*
F Easily influenced	46.1	19.4	3.9
M Not easily influenced	39.0	*67.5	*85.1
M Independent	50.0	*62.3	*61.7
F Dependent	44.7	30.4	31.1
F Home-oriented	50.0	40.3	27.9
M Worldly	38.9	48.0	*58.4
M A leader	39.5	**59.1	*74.6
F A follower	42.1	17.5	9.7
F Gentle	†43.5	*60.4	*63.0
M Rough	31.1	25.9	20.7

* These poles obtained significant percentages of responses (Chi-square, $p \leq 0.01$).

** The 'neither' category for this item obtained 22.1% of responses. Chi-square was significant across the three points and between the two poles.

† The 'neither' category for this item obtained 20.8% of responses. There was a significant difference across the three points using Chi-square ($p \leq 0.01$) but not between the two poles.

4.7.1 Discussion

The sub-hypothesis that men perceive a difference between the *Typical Man*, the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man*, such that the *Typical Man* is described as more stereotypic than the *Self*, and the *Ideal Man* as less stereotypic than the *Self*, was not clearly supported. As Table 11 shows, although the *Self* and *Ideal Man* descriptions included two feminine characteristics which the *Typical Man* description did not, the concepts could not be classified as less stereotypic because most of the items which were undifferentiated on the *Typical Man* description became masculine items on the *Self* and *Ideal Man* descriptions.

The descriptions of all three concepts were very masculine-oriented. The *Typical Man* was described with 19 masculine and 2 feminine adjectives, the *Self* with 21 masculine and 4 feminine adjectives, and the *Ideal Man* with 22 masculine and 4 feminine adjectives (see Table 11). The feminine items consistent across all three concepts were 'warm' and 'emotional'. 'Warm' had been rated on the AVL as socially desirable and 'unemotional' as socially undesirable.

Two items, which had neither pole significantly selected in the *Typical Man* description, became feminine adjectives when included in the *Self* and *Ideal Man* descriptions. These adjectives were 'gentle' and 'easily expresses tender feelings', which were also socially desirable (see Table 4). One disconcerting set of figures was that for the 'gentle/rough' item as 25.9 percent and 20.7 percent of the men rated *Self* and *Ideal Man*, respectively, as 'rough' (see Table 12). This

is a disturbing finding when it is considered that 87.7 percent of men rated 'gentle' as socially desirable. Thus, many men (possibly 25%) who rated 'gentle' as socially desirable did not include it in their *Ideal Man* description.

A noteworthy point about the adjectives in Table 11 is that nine of them show very little difference in the percentages of men rating them for *Self* and *Ideal Man*. These were: practical, realistic, rational, assertive, warm, competent, objective, intelligent and independent. In Table 7, for the female sample, only 'objective' had such close support for *Self* and *Ideal Woman*. There may be a closer association between *Self* and *Ideal Man* for men than there is between *Self* image and *Ideal Woman* for women.

A notable characteristic of the responses across the three concepts was that on only 1 item for *Self*, and on no items for *Ideal Man*, did the sample fail to significantly select one of the poles as descriptive of the concept.

An item on which responses were evenly divided between the two poles for the *Typical Man* was 'independent/dependent', which is unexpected considering the masculine stereotype. Furthermore, although 'independent' was significantly rated as descriptive of *Self* and *Ideal Man*, a third of the sample rated both of these concepts as 'dependent' (see Table 12). Thus, although 'independent' was seen as socially desirable by many men (76.6%), some felt 'dependent' to be an 'ideal' characteristic for men.

The item 'home-oriented/worldly' had even percentages of responses for the *Typical Man* and *Self* descriptions, but the *Ideal Man* was 'worldly'. There seems to be some ambivalence over this item. The figures for social desirability (Table 4) indicate that 53.2 percent rated 'home-oriented' as desirable and 33.8 percent rated it as neither desirable nor undesirable. Thus both 'worldly' and 'home-oriented' may have desirable connotations for men. It would have been useful to have social desirability figures for 'worldly'.

The item 'a leader/a follower' moved from an undifferentiated item for *Typical Man* to 'a leader' for *Self* and *Ideal Man*. The 22.1 percent in the neither category indicates that a substantial percentage of men felt themselves to be neither a leader nor a follower. The high percentage (74.6%) who rated the *Ideal Man* as 'a leader' is perhaps surprising when it is considered that only 52.6 percent rated 'a leader' as socially desirable, while 33.8 percent rated it as neither desirable nor undesirable. Some men who rated it as 'neither' must still have ascribed it to their *Ideal Man*.

In general, the male sample had greater consensus with respect to the characteristics for *Self* and *Ideal Man* than were shown for the *Typical Man*. These two concepts (*Self* and *Ideal Man*) were stereotypically masculine but did have an expressive component in the form of four socially desirable feminine characteristics.

4.8 Results *Sub-hypothesis:*

> The description by women of their *Ideal Man* contains more traditionally feminine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Man*.

Table 13 presents the adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by women as descriptive of the *Typical Man* and the *Ideal Man*. Table 14 shows the items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by women as descriptive for one or both of the concepts *Typical Man* and *Ideal Man*. The relevant percentages are indicated as well as the masculinity or femininity of the adjective. Adjectives which obtained a significant percentage of the responses are noted with an asterix. Because the 'neither' category for the item 'a leader/a follower' obtained such a large percentage of responses (21.6%), Chi-square was computed across the three points rather than between the two poles.

Table 13

The adjectives which were significantly rated ($p \leq 0.01$) by women as descriptive of the *Typical Man* and the *Ideal Man* are indicated, with the percentage of responses for that pole noted. M or F indicates whether the adjective was stereotypically masculine or feminine, according to Broverman (1970).

	Adjective	*Typical Man*	*Ideal Man*
M	Practical	63.5	94.6
M	Active	71.6	91.8
M	Realistic	63.5	92.6
M	Ambitious	68.2	90.6
M	Rational	61.5	91.3
M	Assertive	64.1	85.8
M	Secure	62.1	96.0
M	Strong personality	69.6	95.9
M	Competent	70.3	95.9
M	Objective	51.4	73.6
M	Competitive	66.9	80.4
M	Self-confident	75.6	94.5
M	Logical	60.2	96.0
M	Adventurous	67.6	87.9
M	Dominant	69.5	64.8
M	Consistent	55.5	92.5
M	Intelligent	77.7	96.6
M	Aggressive	64.2	-
M	Not easily influenced	-	79.8
M	Independent	-	63.5
M	A leader	-	76.3
F	Warm	70.9	93.9
F	Emotional	52.6	78.4
F	Easily expresses tender feelings	-	90.5
F	Gentle	-	89.1

Table 14

Items on which neither of the bi-polar adjectives was significantly rated by women as descriptive for one or both of the concepts *Typical Man* and *Ideal Man* are shown. The percentage of women rating each adjective are indicated. M or F denote the masculinity or femininity of the adjective.

Item	*Typical Man*	*Ideal Man*
M Aggressive	*64.2	51.3
F Unaggressive	22.4	39.5
F Easily influenced	46.4	10.9
M Not easily influenced	39.2	*79.8
M Uneasy when expressing tender feelings	50.7	6.0
F Easily expresses tender feelings	36.5	*90.5
M Independent	50.7	*63.5
F Dependent	41.8	33.1
M A leader	†39.2	*76.3
Neither	21.6	17.6
F A follower	37.8	5.4
F Gentle	48.0	*89.1
M Rough	33.0	6.1
F Home-oriented	45.9	52.6
M Worldly	31.8	36.5

* These poles obtained significant percentages of responses (Chi-square, $p \leq 0.01$).

† Because of the size of the 'neither' category responses, Chi-square was computed across the three points. It was not significant.

4.8.1 Discussion

The sub-hypothesis that the description by women of their *Ideal Man* contains more traditionally feminine characteristics than does their description of the *Typical Man* received some support as Table 13 shows. However, it was not strongly supported because of the small number of feminine characteristics included; two for the *Typical Man* and four for the *Ideal Man*. The description of the *Typical Man* thus included 18 masculine and 2 feminine characteristics, and the *Ideal Man* description contained 20 masculine and 4 feminine characteristics. These were the same feminine items included in the descriptions by the male sample.

An interesting result was that for the adjective 'aggressive'. The *Typical Man* was described as aggressive, but responses for the *Ideal Man* indicated that the percentage of women rating that pole fell while the percentage of responses for 'unaggressive' rose (Table 14). This conflicts with the male sample description of the *Ideal Man* as 'aggressive'. The result for women could indicate that aggressiveness may no longer be regarded by women as desirable in men. On the AVL, responses were spread evenly over the three points for the female sample for the item 'unaggressive', and the 38.5 percent who rated it as desirable must also have rated their *Ideal Man* as unaggressive. Women did rate the *Ideal Man* as 'assertive' and this may be becoming the desirable alternative to aggression. However, both men and women did rate their ideal as 'dominant'.

The other item which showed no difference between the poles for the female sample was 'home-oriented/worldly'.

This was true for both their *Typical* and *Ideal Man* descriptions. Men described their *Ideal Man* as 'worldly'. The 52.6 percent of women who described their *Ideal Man* as 'home-oriented' may indicate a desire on the part of many women to make men more a part of the home-oriented environment.

The remaining items in Table 14 all showed no significant difference between the two poles for the *Typical Man*. But these all differentiated for the *Ideal Man*. There is an interesting division of responses between 'gentle' and 'rough' for the *Typical Man* which becomes 'gentle' for the *Ideal Man*. There is a similar movement toward the feminine pole for the characteristic 'easily expresses tender feelings'.

The item 'a leader/a follower' obtained a division of responses between the two poles and the 'neither' category. There is a lack of consensus on this item with respect to the *Typical Man* for both women and men, but the *Ideal Man* had strong support for the 'leader' pole from both samples.

The results indicate an *Ideal Man* who is masculine-oriented but with an expressive component in the form of four feminine characteristics. The male and female samples had very similar descriptions of the *Ideal Man*.

4.9 Concluding comments and a consideration of the influence of methodological variables on the results from the Semantic Differential

There was a strong consensus between the male and female samples on their descriptions of the *Typical Man* and *Woman* and the *Ideal Man* and *Woman* using the Semantic Differential.

This has been found in a number of studies (for example, Frieze et al., 1978; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959; Broverman et al., 1972; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968).

The *Typical Man* and *Typical Woman* have been found elsewhere to be stereotypically defined (Broverman et al., 1972; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968). In the present study this was also true for the *Typical Man*. The *Typical Woman* was more stereotypic than the female *Self* description but had a predominance of male characteristics. The *Typical Woman* was the concept which contained the most feminine characteristics (8 for men and women) of the five concepts rated. But the description was by no means the negative feminine stereotype suggested by the literature (Broverman et al., 1972; Rosenkrantz et al., 1968).

Oskamp (1977) writes that past results have shown remarkable consistency over time and differing samples. Men typically are perceived as possessing competent-intellectual traits, whereas women possess warmth-expressiveness traits. He concludes that women are "also viewed in negative terms as being more passive, dependent and emotional than men" (p. 352). These conclusions differ from the present results in that both men and women included 'competent' traits in the *Typical Man* and the *Typical Woman* descriptions but women were described with more 'expressive' characteristics. Although the *Typical Woman* was 'dependent' she was not 'passive'. Furthermore, although the description included 'emotional', the item 'unemotional' had been rated as socially undesirable, so it

could not be construed as a negative characteristic for this sample.

The *Typical Man* and *Typical Woman* shared a core of similar characteristics, although the *Typical Woman* had more negative feminine characteristics (for example, submissive, a follower, dependent). This is contrary to the expectation that they would be defined as the traditional male and female stereotypes. In their discussion of masculinity and femininity, Spence and Helmreich (1978) consider modal personalities and comment that:

> few inferences can be made about the constellation of co-existing qualities that differentially characterize the 'typical' woman and man and, indeed, whether any constellation exists with sufficient frequency to make the concept of the typical man as opposed to the typical woman a particularly useful one (p. 115).

The results of this study lend some support to that conclusion.

The *Self* descriptions of the two samples also had a core of similar qualities. Recently O'Leary and Depner (1975) found with college students that the male and female self and ideal man were very stereotypic. This was essentially true of the male *Self* in this study and the *Ideal Man* was very masculine-oriented, but the female *Self* was not stereotypic.

Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) also commented (p. 293) that the self-concepts of both the men and women in their sample were very similar to the respective stereotypes and that their female subjects continued to incorporate the negative feminine characteristics into their self-concepts. In the present

study this was not true for women, who described a very masculine-oriented *Self* with positive feminine characteristics.

Gilbert, Deutsch, and Strahan, (1978) used the BSRI to consider the 'typical' and 'ideal' descriptions. Unfortunately item analyses were not used but the BSRI masculinity and femininity scores were.[8] Gilbert et al. found the 'androgynous ideal' to be in the "eye of the social science researcher" rather than that of the "beholder" because the traditional view that men should be more masculine than feminine and that a woman should be more feminine than masculine was still endorsed. These findings would correlate with the *Ideal Man* description on the Semantic Differential in the present study but not with the *Ideal Woman* description.

Again with respect to the 'ideal' concepts, O'Leary and Depner (1975) found the female *Ideal Man* to be stereotypic but the male *Ideal Woman* to be a "Wonderwoman" who was significantly more competent, adventuresome and independent than the female and male self. The authors conclude rather cynically that the male subjects appeared to be trying to avoid being labelled as "Male Chauvinist Pigs". But it is possible that the accepted conceptions of the ideal woman are changing. In the present study the *Ideal Woman* descriptions for both women and men appear to be very similar to the *Ideal Man* with a masculine-

---

[8]This method of scoring the BSRI has been criticised elsewhere (Myers & Sugar, 1978; Rowland, 1979).

orientation but including expressive feminine characteristics. The *Ideal Man* was found, as in the O'Leary and Depner (1975) study, to be stereotypically oriented for both women and men, although it did share four expressive feminine characteristics with the *Ideal Woman*. This inclusion of opposite-sex characteristics in the Ideal description has been found by a number of researchers (for example, Elman, Press, & Rosenkrantz, 1970; McKee & Sherriffs, 1959).

It would be tempting to conclude from these results that the movement for the equality of the sexes over the past decade has had a strong effect on people's perceptions of the typical man and woman and the ideal man and woman; that society now accepts the socially desirable person as one who includes both positive masculine and feminine characteristics, as Rossi (1964) envisaged. Perceptions may have changed due to cultural influence. In past decades women were labelled as 'passive', behaved 'passively' and were perceived as 'passive'. But these characteristics are becoming less acceptable as desirable characteristics (see section 4.2). It is possible that people now reject the negative feminine stereotype, realising that the "stereotypic personalities are not as socially functional for men and women as our society has assumed" (Oskamp, 1977, p.353).

The strong similarity between the descriptions of the five concepts in this study may indicate that people do perceive most people, male and female, and themselves to have a large number of traditionally labelled masculine characteristics.

But these strong similarities and some contradictions between these findings and those of other researchers (Broverman et al., 1972; Gilbert et al., 1978) suggest the necessity for a closer scrutiny of the procedures used to gain these results.

One of the clear points which arises is the large part played by the social desirability of the characteristics used. Many of the masculine characteristics were socially desirable. But the feminine alternatives were often presented in negative terms, for example, with a negative prefix. Some of the alternatives were positive feminine items and these were often used in the descriptions of the concepts. This issue of social desirability, or 'favourability' as Williams and Bennett (1975) called it, is a complex one.

Firstly, it has been found that masculine characteristics are rated more often as socially desirable than are feminine characteristics and this is well documented in the literature (Broverman et al., 1972; Deaux, 1976; Frieze et al., 1978). But Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) noted that in their study this was a function of more male than female traits being positively valued rather than a greater value being attributed to masculine characteristics. This could be a reason for the large number of masculine items used in the concept descriptions in this study - more of the masculine items were seen as socially desirable (results from the AVL would support this). An assumption inherent in this argument is that people chose items because of their social desirability rather than for their appropriateness, and this may not necessarily be true (see Rosenkrantz et al.,

1968).

The items on the Semantic Differential were limited, presenting more negative than positive alternative feminine characteristics. But it may be that it is very difficult to find items which are specifically feminine and socially desirable apart from the 'warm-emotional' cluster. Broverman et al. (1972) have also argued that the feminine stereotype is less favourable than the male stereotype based on the finding that most masculine adjectives were favourable and most feminine items unfavourable. But, as Stoppard and Kalin (1978) point out, this may "well have been due to an initial bias in the pool of descriptive items" (p.216).

A study by Williams, Giles, Edwards, Best, and Daws (1977) further exemplifies the limitations, though, when it draws a picture of male and female stereotypes from American, Irish and English subjects, labelling them "Amengire" stereotypes. The adjectives composing the female stereotype include: affectionate, dreamy, frivolous, fussy, nagging and whiny. In fact, the male stereotype is weighted on the positive side again. It may be, then, that most characteristics which are favourable or desirable are masculine while most feminine characteristics are the opposite or alternative and, therefore, negative characteristics.

In another study, Williams and Bennett (1975) initially seemed to find support for this contention. In their study using the Adjective Check List they found that, in the stereotypes they generated, ten (10) of the fifteen (15) male

evaluative characteristics were rated as 'favourable' while ten (10) of the fifteen (15) female adjectives were scored as 'unfavourable'. The male stereotype appeared as more favourable.

But Williams and Bennett (1975) then expanded their stereotype lists by changing the criterion level (from 75% to 60%). The items which were then added to the stereotype contained more unfavourable masculine characteristics and more favourable feminine characteristics. Their first focused list was labelled as the primary stereotype and their second expanded list as the secondary stereotype. They then concluded that while the primary male stereotype is more favourable than the female, the secondary female stereotype is more favourable than the male.

The favourability or desirability of the male or female stereotype thus depends on the level of penetration into the stereotype. The items used on the Semantic Differential in the present study would thus only relate to the primary stereotype. The items were limited in number and gave respondents limited choice of alternatives.

Williams and Bennett also comment that the favourability of male and female stereotypes needs further study with more precise methods than have yet been employed. The AVL used in the present study related only to the items on the Semantic Differential and was limited by that frame of reference. The set of characteristics which were rated as socially desirable thus reappeared in the concept descriptions.

The results from these Semantic Differential concepts yield a very clear response to the primary stereotypes. The *Typical Woman* incorporated some negative feminine characteristics as well as positive masculine and feminine items. The female *Self* was less stereotypic and the *Ideal Woman* (for both men and women) was described using the positive masculine and feminine characteristics. The pattern was a little different for men, as all three male concepts contained large numbers of masculine characteristics. The difference between the concepts lay in the slight increase in positive feminine characteristics from the *Typical Man* to the *Ideal Man* description. But, although some items yielded an insight into the changing values of certain characteristics (for example, aggression), it was often the items which failed to differentiate to a specific pole which gave the most useful information, rather than those used in concept descriptions.

It may be useful to increase the set of characteristics used, as in the Adjective Check List, to include the secondary stereotype characteristics, but the result may be that subjects would continue to rate their *Self* and *Ideal* concepts in relation to the perceived desirability of the characteristics offered.

The forced-choice procedure is also a problem as it presents a frame of reference to the subject which forces his or her perceptions into a preconceived context. If, for example, the subject is presented with a set of stereotypic characteristics and asked to describe a 'typical' person, it

should not be too surprising that a description related to the stereotype emerges. When a subject is presented with an unstructured stimulus (for example, 'a mature adult') two primary factors operate in the response process. Firstly, the subject's own stereotypic patterning influences the response, and secondly, the response alternatives structured by the instrument also guide the subject. Subjects may be being forced to respond to items which are not salient to them (Cowan & Stewart, 1977).

A study which illuminated some of the problems with adjective descriptions was conducted by Cowan and Stewart (1977). They tested subjects using the Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) Stereotype Questionnaire, the Adjective Check List, and an Open-ended questionnaire. Originally, Rosenkrantz et al. (1968) had asked for responses to an adult male, an adult female and the self on the one questionnaire form. To stop subjects from contrasting their responses, Cowan and Stewart gave them separate response forms. They also set a lower criterion level. They found 10 stereotypic items as opposed to Rosenkrantz et al.'s 41 items and attributed this to reductions in demand characteristics. But the Adjective Check List results indicated yet a different male and female stereotype.

The Open-ended form produced a third and different set of items which Cowan and Stewart described as not stereotypic. They were, in fact, a different group of adjectives to those usually associated with the stereotypes. For example, the male list included - tall, well-dressed, friendly, mature, polite, and the female list included - intelligent, friendly, mature and easy to get along with.

Thus the three measures obtained different responses. Cowan and Stewart (1977) noted also that the visual imagery of specific persons appears to be involved in the subject's stereotyping process. After the second phase of their study, the authors concluded that different instruments convey different stereotypic items which affect the perception of, for example, desirability.

The difficulties which have been discussed highlight the methodological problems associated with the use of the Semantic Differential in this kind of study.[9] The use of a limited set of characteristics which are bi-polar means a negative alternative is often presented to the respondent. Furthermore, since the controversy over the dualistic nature of masculinity and femininity arose (Bem, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1978), the presentation of bi-polar adjectives has been criticised and may be misleading. The contention within the 'androgyny' theory that an individual can be, for example, both dependent and independent (Bem, 1974) is not accommodated for on the Semantic Differential. The subject chooses either pole or the 'neither' category and the bi-polar conception of personality is endorsed.

The Semantic Differential used in the present study shared the methodological faults of many similar instruments used in this area of research, for example, the Stereotype Questionnaire.

---

[9]The possibility of sex differences in responding on the Semantic Differential have been dealt with elsewhere and will not be discussed in detail here. Sex differences in rating patterns have been found in some studies (e.g., Parsonson, 1969b). Benel and Benel (1976), however, found no sex differences in their study. The present results also indicate no sex difference of response pattern.

It used forced-choice procedure with a limited set of bi-polar alternatives, the most socially desirable items being masculine. The results were relevant only to the primary stereotypes but did indicate that in general people were ready to reject most negative traditional feminine characteristics, even for the *Typical Woman*. Indications were that many traditional masculine characteristics are now perceived as socially desirable for any person (irrespective of sex) and these were incorporated into *Self* and *Ideal* descriptions for both men and women. However, the secondary stereotypic characteristics were not penetrated by the Semantic Differential. As Cowan and Stewart (1977) argue, the instruments used in this type of assessment need to be greatly improved.

Chapter Five Results and Discussion : The Bem Sex-Role Inventory

The following results and discussion relate to the aim of the study with respect to the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, that is, to investigate its use with an Australian sample by considering the factor structure of the scale and the distribution of responses using the median-split method of classification (number 3 in the list of hypotheses and aims).

5.1 Results: Factor analysis and item-total correlations.

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) data were factor analysed to determine whether the items formed two independent dimensions of masculinity and femininity, as was envisaged in the measure's original design. There had been factor analyses of the items with North American (Gaudreau, 1977) and British respondents (Whetton and Swindell, 1977), but there had been no investigation of the factor structure with an Australian sample.[10] Item-total correlations were also calculated to provide an indication of the internal consistency of the scale.

Factor Analysis

The principal axis method was used to factor analyse the BSRI data. Factors with eigen values greater than one were then rotated using varimax rotation (as in the Gaudreau, 1977 and Whetton and Swindell, 1977 studies). The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was utilised and separate analyses were performed on data from both sexes, as in the Whetton and Swindell (1977) study.

---

[10]The Feather (1978b) study appeared after this analysis was completed.

The results from the male data indicated four meaningful factors after rotation which, in all, accounted for 78.4 percent of the variance. These factors are included in Table 15 with their BSRI items, loadings and M or F indicating whether the item was masculine or feminine on the BSRI. Results from the female data are presented in Table 16 and also reveal four meaningful factors.

Table 15

The first four factors extracted from the BSRI for males.

		Loadings
Factor 1 (44% of variance)		
Expressive		
F	Gentle	.87
F	Warm	.79
F	Sympathetic	.77
F	Tender	.76
F	Sensitive to the needs of others	.76
F	Compassionate	.72
F	Loyal	.69
F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	.67
F	Loves children	.64
F	Soft-spoken	.61
F	Affectionate	.57
F	Understanding	.53
F	Cheerful	.49
F	Does not use harsh language	.37
M	Analytical	.35
M	Willing to take a stand	.34
M	Masculine	.31
M	Independent	.31
M	Strong personality	.30
Factor 2 (19.8% of variance)		
Independent/Active		
M	Self-sufficient	.62
M	Makes decisions easily	.59
M	Independent	.58
M	Willing to take a stand	.56
M	Ambitious	.55
M	Willing to take risks	.54
M	Defends own beliefs	.54
M	Competitive	.52
M	Individualistic	.44
F	Understanding	.43
M	Forceful	.42
M	Has leadership abilities	.41
M	Strong personality	.40
F	Cheerful	.36
F	Affectionate	.31
M	Acts as a leader	.30
F	Loves children	.30
Factor 3 (7.2% of variance)		
Forceful/Power		
M	Dominant	.87
M	Aggressive	.77
M	Acts as a leader	.60
M	Assertive	.56
M	Forceful	.55
M	Analytical	.49
M	Has leadership abilities	.44
M	Strong personality	.38
M	Individualistic	.31
M	Makes decisions easily	.30
Factor 4 (7.0% of variance)		
Powerless		
F	Gullible	.80
F	Childlike	.45
F	Shy	.33
F	Does not use harsh language	.31

Table 16

The first four factors extracted from the BSRI for females.

		Loadings
Factor 1 (31.9% of variance)		
Expressive		
F	Sensitive to the needs of others	.79
F	Tender	.74
F	Gentle	.74
F	Compassionate	.73
F	Sympathetic	.67
F	Understanding	.63
F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	.63
F	Warm	.63
F	Loves children	.58
F	Loyal	.52
M	Willing to take a stand	.43
F	Soft-spoken	.41
F	Feminine	.38
M	Defends own beliefs	.35
F	Affectionate	.32
Factor 2 (23.3% of variance)		
Decisive/Active		
M	Dominant	.81
M	Aggressive	.74
M	Has leadership abilities	.68
M	Forceful	.67
M	Acts as a leader	.64
M	Assertive	.60
M	Strong personality	.47
M	Makes decisions easily	.41
M	Willing to take a stand	.40
M	Competitive	.38
M	Self-sufficient	.36
M	Individualistic	.34
M	Ambitious	.33
M	Willing to take risks	.32
Factor 3 (9.4% of variance)		
Leadership/Competition		
M	Competitive	.70
M	Ambitious	.68
M	Athletic	.45
M	Acts as a leader	.31
M	Has leadership abilities	.30
Factor 4 (6.6% of variance)		
Independence		
M	Independent	.83
M	Self-sufficient	.52
M	Self-reliant	.46

Item-total Correlations

The results of the correlation of the masculine items with the total masculine score, and the feminine items with the total feminine score, are shown in Table 17.

For males, item-total correlations of masculine items with the total masculinity score were all significant at the 0.01 level. Correlations for the feminine items with the total femininity score indicated that four items did not correlate significantly. These items were: 'shy', 'feminine', 'gullible' and 'childlike'.

For females, correlations between masculine items and the total masculinity score indicated that only the item 'Masculine' did not correlate significantly. The correlations for the feminine items with the total femininity score were similar to those of the male sample. Items which did not correlate significantly were: 'flatterable', 'gullible' and 'childlike', and the item 'shy' had a very low correlation (0.26).

Table 17

Item-total correlations for the masculine items on the BSRI with the total masculinity score, and the feminine items with the total femininity score, for males and females (italicised).

Masculine items	Males	Females	Feminine items	Males	Females
Self-reliant	0.34	*0.36*	Yielding	0.33	*0.30*
Defends own beliefs	0.47	*0.31*	Cheerful	0.56	*0.39*
Independent	0.62	*0.43*	Shy	0.19	*0.25*
Athletic	0.34	*0.28*	Affectionate	0.63	*0.49*
Assertive	0.64	*0.63*	Flatterable	0.39	*0.20*
Strong personality	0.63	*0.57*	Loyal	0.69	*0.48*
Forceful	0.64	*0.69*	Feminine	0.07	*0.60*
Analytical	0.50	*0.34*	Sympathetic	0.76	*0.59*
Has leadership abilities	0.70	*0.71*	Sensitive to the needs of others	0.70	*0.68*
Willing to take risk	0.58	*0.44*	Understanding	0.60	*0.57*
Makes decisions easily	0.60	*0.45*	Compassionate	0.71	*0.68*
Self-sufficient	0.64	*0.54*	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	0.68	*0.63*
Dominant	0.64	*0.69*	Soft-spoken	0.64	*0.55*
Masculine	0.40	*0.11*	Warm	0.76	*0.73*
Willing to take a stand	0.68	*0.54*	Tender	0.73	*0.76*
Aggressive	0.58	*0.65*	Gullible	0.14	*0.22*
Acts as a leader	0.71	*0.66*	Childlike	0.22	*0.17*
Individualistic	0.57	*0.49*	Does not use harsh language	0.46	*0.28*
Competitive	0.59	*0.60*	Loves children	0.71	*0.51*
Ambitious	0.63	*0.55*	Gentle	0.82	*0.73*

5.1.1 Discussion: Factor analyses and item-total correlations.

The factor analysis of the BSRI data revealed no significant negative loadings. This may have been a result either of the espoused social desirability of the characteristics or of the separate analysis of the male and female sample responses.

For the male sample, factor one after rotation accounted for 44.5 percent of the variance and can be labelled an expressive (feminine-oriented) factor. If items with loadings of 0.35 and above are considered this factor contains all feminine items with the exception of 'analytical' which has a low value of 0.35. The factor would thus indicate empathy, affection and sensitivity, the positive or socially desirable aspects of femininity.

The second factor accounted for 19.8 percent of the total variance and again, if loadings of 0.35 or above are considered, it is an independence or activity factor indicating independence and decision-making abilities. All items would be masculine with the exception of 'cheerful' and 'understanding', giving the factor a masculine-orientation.

The third factor is a forceful or power factor. It contains items which are masculine and indicate strength and dominance, and accounts for 7.2 percent of the variance.

These results are similar to those of Gaudreau (1977) and Waters, Waters, and Pincus (1977) which indicated clear 'masculine' and 'feminine' factors. Furthermore, Feather (1978b), in the only Australian factor analysis of the scale, also found an expressive factor similar to factor one and a dominance factor similar to factor three.

The third factor is also similar to Whetton and Swindell's second factor which they labelled 'Power'. However, if all item loadings of 0.30 and above are considered, as is commonly applicable (Nunnally, 1967) and has been used by Waters et al. (1977) Gaudreau (1977) and Feather (1978b), a slightly different picture emerges which does not delineate the factors in the present study so clearly.

Firstly, factor one, for the male sample, would now include the masculine items: 'independent', 'strong personality', 'analytical', 'masculine' and 'willing to take a stand'. This factor could then be relabelled an expressive - androgynous factor, portraying a person who was expressive yet had strength. The inclusion of the item 'masculine' is interesting and indicates a relationship between masculinity and those feminine traits for the men in the sample.

Factor two would also have the additional items: 'affectionate', 'acts as a leader' and 'loves children'. The factor definition would then have four feminine items. It would be an independent-leadership factor with affectionate-understanding characteristics, and could be labelled an active-androgynous factor.

The third factor would be reinforced as a forceful-power factor, with the inclusion of the items: 'individualistic', 'strong personality' and 'makes decisions easily'. The fourth and final factor would appear as a contrasting factor to factor 3 and could be labelled a powerless factor.

Results from the female sample were similar to the initial male factor pattern and there is no difference in the female sample factors if either 0.30 or 0.35 are taken as the cut-off points. Factor one appears as an expressive (feminine) factor. There are, however, two masculine items - 'defends own beliefs' and 'willing to take a stand' - indicating a strength element. This factor accounted for 31.9 percent of the variance.

The second factor was masculine-oriented, as was the second factor for males. It too indicates a decisive-active factor. The third factor differs from the male third factor and is a leadership and competition factor, and the fourth factor is a definite independence factor (both are masculine-oriented).

These results from the female sample are similar to those of previous studies in having 'masculine' and 'feminine' oriented factors. But the masculine items in the present study were split into three factors. The independence factor (4) is similar to factor four in Whetton and Swindell's (1977) study, which they labelled 'autonomy'. Feather (1978b) found a similar factor in his Australian study, although it also included the item 'individualistic'. Waters et al. (1977) and Gaudreau (1977) also found a factor which was similar, though both studies had items such as 'gullible', 'childlike' and 'flatterable' included. This questions Gaudreau's description of the factor as "a neutral 'maturity' factor" (p.301).

The items which did not load significantly on any factors were, for males: 'yielding', 'flatterable', 'athletic', 'self-reliant' and 'feminine'. For females the items not included in

the first four factors were: 'yielding', 'flatterable', 'cheerful', 'shy', 'analytical', 'masculine', 'does not use harsh language', 'gullible' and 'childlike'. With the exception of 'yielding' and 'cheerful', all of these items were found by either Gaudreau (1977) or Waters et al. (1977) to have low loadings or not to have loaded on any factor. These authors suggest that the items could be eliminated from the scale.

The factor analyses of the BSRI indicate that an assumption of two independent dimensions is questionable. This is further emphasized by Whetton and Swindell's (1977) finding of five meaningful factors. Although their first two factors were sex-typed, they accounted for only 17 percent of the total variance which, the authors note, was not large enough to support the concept of two sex-typed scales. The present study found the two sex-typed factors to account for a larger percentage of the variance. However, the items in general were split into a number of meaningful factors as in the Whetton and Swindell study.

It should be noted also that only the 'masculine' and 'feminine' items from the BSRI were used in the present study, which could account for the absence of a 'neuroticism' factor, as in the Whetton and Swindell (1977) study, or a 'positive-affective attitude' factor as in the Feather (1978b) study. These appeared to have been related mainly to the 'neutral' BSRI items.

The results for the factor analysis were also predictable because of the type of items involved, for example, 'expressive' clusters and 'strength' clusters. Items seem to be clustering along meaning dimensions such as these, rather than on a clear masculine-feminine dimension; and as Whetton and Swindells (1977) have noted, the notion of two independent dimensions (masculinity and femininity) may be as simplistic as the traditional assumption of one dimension. Feather (1978b) further comments that the BSRI is factorally complex and that, as Whetton and Swindell (1977) note, it is questionable whether the difference score originally used to define androgyny is meaningful.

The item-total correlations indicate a strong degree of internal consistency. All masculine items correlated significantly with the total masculinity score, with the exception of the item 'masculine' for females. For males, the item 'feminine' also failed to correlate with the femininity total. This result was expected because Gaudreau (1977) notes that the items 'masculine' and 'feminine' essentially act only to differentiate males and females but not masculinity and femininity.

The items which failed to correlate significantly were: 'shy', 'gullible', 'childlike' and 'flatterable'. Feather (1978b) also found that two of these items failed to correlate significantly with the femininity score: 'shy' (0.14) and 'flatterable' (0.11). These items did not load significantly on any factors in the factor analyses and this is further support for the suggestion noted earlier that they could be dropped from the scale.

5.2 Results: Median-split method of grouping data.

The median-split method[11] (Bem, 1977; Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp, 1975) was utilised to group the data into four groups: Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous and Undifferentiated. The percentages of males and females in each group are presented in Table 18. Table 18 also contains the data, in percentages, from the studies of Bem (1977), Russell, Antill, and Cunningham (1978) and Berzins, Welling, and Wetter (1978).

The medians of the present sample were for masculinity, 4.451, and for femininity, 4.749.

---

[11] See Chapter Two for scoring methods of the BSRI.

Table 18

Data in percentages, grouped according to the median-split method, for the present Australian general population sample. Results from the Bem (1977), Russell, Antill and Cunningham (1978), and Berzins, Welling and Wetter (1978) studies are also presented for comparison.

Subjects	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous	Undifferentiated	N
Males:					
Australian population data	35	8	29	28	154
Berzins et al. (1978)	48.7	10.4	18.7	22.1	891
Bem (1977)	37	16	20	27	375
Russell et al. (1977), students	42	13	20	25	327
Russell et al. (1978), population data	38	10	26	26	54
Females:					
Australian population data	10	40	25	25	148
Berzins et al. (1978)	13.6	48.1	20.3	17.9	1255
Bem (1977)	16	34	29	21	290
Russell et al. (1978), students	16	42	24	18	746
Russell et al. (1978), population data	16	34	29	20	56

5.2.1 Discussion: Grouped data using the median-split method.

The data from the present study presented in Table 18 show that the Androgynous and Undifferentiated groups contain similar percentages of people for both males and females (29% - 28% and 25% - 25% respectively). Thus 57 percent of males and 50 percent of females were not categorized as sex-typed. There were also similar distributions for males and females in their respective same-sex groups (35% and 40%) and in the opposite-sex groups (8% and 10%). These figures are compared with those from other studies in Table 18 and there are obvious similarities across groups. In fact, the uniformity of response indicates that these different samples have similar ratios of sex-typed to non sex-typed people, as established by the BSRI.

On closer examination, however, it is clear that this uniformity is the result of a scoring artifact which makes the use of the median-split method unsatisfactory for a number of reasons.

Firstly, the use of the median essentially puts an upper limit on the number of people who will belong to either of the four groups because only half of the total sample can be above or below the median. Thus no more than 50 percent of the total sample can be, for example, androgynous. Moreover, once a distribution of responses is fixed for one cell of the 2 x 2 classification system (around the median), the distribution in all of the other cells is set. A further limitation imposed by this scoring method is that sample comparisons are limited in value because the median varies from sample to sample.

Secondly, the median used in this method is actually the median of the mean masculinity and femininity scores, and these means are based on interval rating points. The value of this mean is questionable and it masks whether respondents scored high and low on equal numbers of items or whether they rated consistently around the mean point.

Thirdly, many mean scores were bunched around the median points; for example, in this sample 108 of the 302 people had mean masculinity scores between 4 and 5, and 134 had mean femininity scores between points 4 and 5. The medians for masculinity and femininity were 4.451 and 4.749 respectively so large numbers of scores were clustered around these.[12] Classifying these people with close scores into such differently labelled groups seems arbitrary and artificial. It means that some respondents with very similar mean masculinity and femininity scores may be classified into different groups.

In spite of these drawbacks researchers do continue to separate their samples into the four groups using the median-split method and often use these groupings as a basis for further research (for example, Jones, Chernovetz, & Hansson, 1978). Bem herself has cited data which validate this

---

[12]Median points for other samples were also similar. For example the masculinity median of the Russell et al. (1978) and Bem (1977) samples were 4.60 and 4.89 respectively, and their femininity medians were 4.75 and 4.76 respectively.

differentiation behaviourally to a certain extent (Bem, 1977). But no research seems to discuss which items these groups actually use to describe themselves, where the differences between groups lie with respect to self-description and whether there are any similarities between groups. Thus, although it is assumed that 'masculine' respondents would give high ratings to masculine adjectives and low ratings to feminine items, and that 'androgynous' individuals would rate both masculine and feminine items highly, there has been no response analysis to support this. The necessity for a closer look at item responses is reinforced by the uncertainty about what kind of a person the 'androgynous' individual is and by the lack of discussion of the characteristics of the 'undifferentiated' group, which is often ignored. The responses from the four median-split groups were therefore analysed to gain a clearer picture of the BSRI self-descriptions of these groups of people.

5.3 Results: Item responses for the masculine, feminine, androgynous and undifferentiated groups.

Responses on the BSRI were further analysed by considering the frequencies on each item for each of the four groups. Respondents were asked to respond on a seven point rating scale, but this scale was collapsed for ease of analysis and discussion. The original seven point scale, with the collapsed scale points in parentheses, was as follows:

1. Never or almost never true	)	
	)	(1. "usually not true")
2. Usually not true	)	
3. Sometimes true	)	
	)	(4. "occasionally true")
4. Occasionally true	)	
5. Often true	)	
	)	
6. Usually true	)	(7. "usually true")
	)	
7. Always or almost always true	)	

This resulted in three sets of frequencies for each item, indicating the number of people who rated the item as "usually true", "usually not true" or "occasionally true" of them. Although the "usually true" rating point encompassed three points of the seven point scale (5, 6 and 7), while the others included only two points (1 and 2, 3 and 4), this was unavoidable because the BSRI point "often true" appeared to fit more logically with "usually true" than with "occasionally true".[13]

For each of the BSRI groups, a one-variable Chi-square was then computed across these three sets of frequencies, for each

---

[13]The rating points of the BSRI give some cause for concern because they may be prone to descriptive inaccuracy. Mischel (1968) discusses this point in a general reference to response alternatives, and notes that individuals differ in their interpretation of such terms as "often" and "frequently". He cites a study by Simpson (1944) who asked students to indicate what percentage of time corresponded to items such as "usually", "often", "frequently", "occasionally" or "seldom". A whole range of percentages were obtained for each of the words. For example, 25% of subjects applied "frequently" only to events which happened at least 80% of the time while a further 25% said it applied to things that happen less than 40% of the time. It would perhaps be more useful in the light of these findings to enable the respondent to use a 7 point rating scale with no directions apart from the comment that "7" would be completely applicable to him/herself and "1" completely non-applicable.

item. Items which were significant ($p \leq 0.01$) then had a further one variable Chi-square computed for the two points with the closest frequencies ($p \leq 0.05$). This yielded a clear picture of which items were rated as descriptive or not descriptive for each group. Some items were rated significantly as "usually true", "usually not true" or "occasionally true". However, others had similar frequencies on the "occasionally true" rating point and the "usually true" or "not true" point. Those items which showed no significant difference across the three points were labelled "non-discriminating".

The data for these analyses were extensive and have been included in Appendix C. The following tables include all the items on the BSRI grouped according to their Chi-square result under the headings noted above. The percentage of responses for each significantly selected item is also shown. M or F indicate the masculinity or femininity of the item on the BSRI.

As indicated by the figures in Table 18, some groups had too few respondents in them to make item-response analysis meaningful. These groups were the 'feminine' males (N=12) and the 'masculine' females (N=15), and they have been excluded from the following tables.

Tables 19 and 20 present the descriptions for the 'masculine' male and 'feminine' female groups. Tables 21 and 22 present the self-descriptions of the 'androgynous' male and female groups and the 'undifferentiated' male and female groups respectively.

Table 19

The self-descriptions of the 'masculine' male group on the BSRI are presented. Items which were significantly rated as "usually true" and "usually not true" are indicated. Items which were significant across the three rating points but which failed to significantly differ on two points are indicated as "occasionally/usually true" and "occasionally/usually not true". The "non-discriminating" items showed no differences across the three points. The percentage of responses at the significant points are noted as well as the masculinity or femininity of the BSRI item. Where two sets of percentages are noted, the "occasionally true" figure is always first.

Usually True		Usually Not True		Occasionally/ Usually True		Occasionally True/ Usually Not True	
M Self-reliant	80.0	F Feminine	98.2	F Compassionate	45.5, 45.5	F Yielding	47.3, 41.8
M Defends own beliefs	85.5	F Gullible	67.3	F Warm	41.8, 54.5	F Flatterable	30.9, 52.7
M Independent	96.4	F Childlike	76.4	F Tender	52.7, 40.0		
M Athletic	52.7			F Gentle	32.7, 54.5		
M Assertive	61.8			F Sympathetic	36.4, 54.5		
M Strong personality	74.5						
M Forceful	81.8						
M Analytical	58.2						
M Has leadership abilities	81.8						
M Willing to take risks	70.9			Non-Discriminating			
M Makes decisions easily	81.8						
M Self-sufficient	83.6			F Shy			
M Dominant	65.5			F Eager to soothe hurt feelings			
M Masculine	94.5			F Soft-spoken			
M Willing to take a stand	87.3			F Does not use harsh language			
M Aggressive	58.2						
M Acts as a leader	72.7						
M Individualistic	81.8						
M Competitive	78.2						
M Ambitious	90.9						
F Cheerful	70.9						
F Affectionate	60.0						
F Loyal	81.8						
F Sensitive to the needs of others	58.2						
F Understanding	72.7						
F Loves children	70.9						

Table 20

The self-descriptions of the 'feminine' female group on the BSRI are presented. Items which were significantly rated as "usually true", "usually not true" and "occasionally true" are indicated. Items which were significant across the three rating points but which failed to significantly differ on two points are indicated as "occasionally/usually true" and "occasionally true/usually not true". The "non-discriminating" items were those which showed no differences across the three points. The percentage of responses at the significant points are noted, as well as the masculinity or femininity of the BSRI item. Where two sets of percentages are noted, the "occasionally true" figure is always first.

Usually True		Usually Not True		Occasionally/ Usually True		Occasionally True/ Usually Not True	
F Cheerful	87.9	M Athletic	67.8	M Individualistic	31.6, 54.5	M Has leadership abilities	37.3, 59.3
F Affectionate	94.9	M Forceful	56.9	M Self-sufficient	39.7, 50.0	M Competitive	42.4, 44.1
F Loyal	98.3	M Dominant	57.6	M Willing to take a stand	40.7, 52.5		
F Feminine	93.2	M Masculine	98.3				
F Sympathetic	98.3	M Aggressive	69.5				
F Sensitive to the needs of others	94.9	M Acts as a leader	66.1				
F Understanding	98.3	F Childlike	72.4				
F Compassionate	89.8	F Gullible	58.6				
F Eager to soothe hurt feelings	87.9						
F Soft-spoken	72.9						
F Warm	98.3						
F Tender	93.2						
F Loves children	93.2						
F Gentle	98.3						
M Self-reliant	71.9						
M Defends own beliefs	93.0						
M Independent	78.0						

Non-Discriminating

M Ambitious
M Assertive
M Strong personality
M Analytical
M Willing to take risks
M Makes decisions easily
F Does not use harsh language
F Shy

Table 21

The self-description of the 'androgynous' male and female groups on the BSRI are presented. Items which were significantly rated as "usually true", "usually not true" and "occasionally true" are indicated. Items which were significant across the three collapsed rating points but which failed to significantly differ on two points are indicated as "occasionally/usually true" and "occasionally true/usually not true". The "non-discriminating" items were those which showed no differences across the three points. The percentage of responses at the significant points are noted, as well as the masculinity or femininity of the BSRI item. Where two sets of percentages are noted, the "occasionally true" figure is always first.

Males			Females		
Usually True			Usually True		
M	Self-reliant	79.5	M	Self-reliant	86.5
M	Defends own beliefs	97.7	M	Defends own beliefs	97.2
M	Independent	100.0	M	Independent	86.5
M	Assertive	68.2	M	Assertive	75.7
M	Strong personality	81.8	M	Strong personality	89.2
M	Analytical	63.6	M	Analytical	68.6
M	Has leadership abilities	81.8	M	Willing to take risks	56.8
M	Willing to take risks	81.8	M	Makes decisions easily	69.4
M	Makes decisions easily	72.1	M	Self-sufficient	91.9
M	Self-sufficient	90.9	M	Willing to take a stand	94.4
M	Masculine	93.2	M	Individualistic	85.3
M	Willing to take a stand	95.5	M	Competitive	63.9
M	Individualistic	73.8	M	Ambitious	75.0
M	Competitive	88.4	F	Cheerful	97.3
M	Ambitious	84.1	F	Affectionate	97.2
F	Cheerful	90.9	F	Loyal	100.0
F	Affectionate	97.7	F	Feminine	91.9
F	Flatterable	58.1	F	Sympathetic	91.9
F	Loyal	100.0	F	Sensitive to the needs of others	100.0
F	Sympathetic	100.0	F	Understanding	88.9
F	Sensitive to the needs of others	95.5	F	Compassionate	91.9
F	Understanding	93.0	F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	94.6
F	Compassionate	88.4	F	Soft-spoken	58.3
F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	90.9	F	Warm	97.2
F	Soft-spoken	68.2	F	Tender	100.0
F	Warm	97.7	F	Loves children	94.4
F	Tender	90.9	F	Gentle	94.4
F	Loves children	100.0			
F	Gentle	100.0			

(cont. p.132)

(Table 21 cont.)

	Occasionally/Usually True			Occasionally/Usually True	
M	Athletic	48.8, 39.5	M	Has leadership abilities	35.1, 62.2
M	Acts as a leader	50.0, 40.9	M	Forceful	54.1, 37.8
F	Yielding	31.0, 54.8	M	Aggressive	40.0, 51.4
			M	Acts as a leader	52.8, 38.9
			F	Yielding	51.4, 40.5
	Usually Not True			Usually Not True	
F	Feminine	93.2	M	Masculine	86.1
F	Gullible	58.1	F	Childlike	65.6
F	Childlike	62.8			
	Non-Discriminating			Non-Discriminating	
M	Forceful		M	Dominant	
M	Dominant		M	Athletic	
M	Aggressive		F	Flatterable	
F	Does not use harsh language		F	Gullible	
F	Shy		F	Does not use harsh language	
			F	Shy	

Table 22

The self-descriptions of the 'undifferentiated' male and female groups on the BSRI are presented. Items which were significantly rated as "usually true", "usually not true" and "occasionally true" are indicated. Items which were significant across the three collapsed rating points but which failed to significantly differ on two points are indicated as "occasionally/usually true" and "occasionally true/usually not true". The "non-discriminating" items were those which showed no differences across the three points. The percentage of responses at the significant points are noted, as well as the masculinity or femininity of the BSRI item. Where two sets of percentages are noted, the "occasionally true" figure is always first.

Males		Females	
Usually True		**Usually True**	
M Defends own beliefs	62.8	M Defends own beliefs	73.0
M Independent	72.1	F Loyal	78.4
M Masculine	65.1	F Sympathetic	70.3
F Warm	58.1	F Understanding	64.9
F Loves children	65.1	F Loves Children	70.3
F Gentle	55.8		
F Loyal	67.4		
Occasionally True		**Occasionally True**	
F Yielding	58.1	F Yielding	62.2
M Assertive	65.1	M Assertive	59.5
M Analytical	58.1	M Analytical	64.9
		M Willing to take risks	59.5
Occasionally/Usually True		**Occasionally/Usually True**	
M Self-reliant	37.2, 58.1	M Self-reliant	32.4, 62.2
M Self-sufficient	51.2, 34.9	M Self-sufficient	40.5, 48.6
M Willing to take a stand	53.2, 41.9	M Independent	32.4, 59.5
M Understanding	41.9, 48.8	M Makes decisions easily	59.5, 29.7
F Cheerful	39.5, 53.5	F Sensitive to the needs of others	40.5, 54.1
		F Warm	35.1, 56.8
		F Affectionate	45.9, 51.4
		F Feminine	35.1, 48.6
		F Compassionate	45.9, 45.9
		F Cheerful	32.4, 56.8
		F Gentle	45.9, 51.4

(cont. p.134)

(Table 22 cont.)

Usually Not True		
F	Feminine	90.7
F	Childlike	60.5
Occasionally True/Usually Not True		
M	Dominant	60.5, 32.6
M	Aggressive	58.1, 27.9
M	Forceful	53.5, 39.5
F	Gullible	37.2, 53.5
Non-Discriminating		
M	Athletic	
M	Strong personality	
M	Has leadership abilities	
M	Willing to take risks	
M	Makes decisions easily	
M	Acts as a leader	
M	Individualistic	
M	Competitive	
M	Ambitious	
F	Shy	
F	Affectionate	
F	Flatterable	
F	Sympathetic	
F	Sensitive to the needs of others	
F	Compassionate	
F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	
F	Soft-spoken	
F	Tender	
F	Does not use harsh language	

Usually Not True		
M	Masculine	73.0
F	Childlike	64.9
Occasionally True/Usually Not True		
M	Aggressive	51.4, 48.6
M	Competitive	51.4, 32.4
F	Gullible	35.1, 51.4
Non-Discriminating		
M	Athletic	
M	Strong personality	
M	Forceful	
M	Has leadership abilities	
M	Dominant	
M	Willing to take a stand	
M	Acts as a leader	
M	Individualistic	
M	Ambitious	
F	Shy	
F	Flatterable	
F	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	
F	Soft-spoken	
F	Tender	
F	Does not use harsh language	

5.3.1 Discussion: Response analysis of the BSRI

The traditional groups: 'masculine' males and 'feminine' females.

Table 19 presents the self-descriptions for the 'masculine' male group. The items which were rated as "usually true" of this group included 20 masculine items and 6 feminine items. This indicates a traditionally oriented self-description but the inclusion of the six traditionally feminine adjectives gives the definition an expressive component.

The items which were "occasionally/usually true" were five of the 'softer' feminine characteristics, 'compassionate', 'warm', 'tender', 'gentle' and 'sympathetic'. Responses for these items indicate that the 'masculine' male group generally included them in their self-description, although one third to half of the sample, only "occasionally". There is, then, more support from the group for the feminine items than would be expected of the stereotypic masculine male.

Items which were rejected as 'usually untrue' were feminine, but 'gullible' and 'childlike' were items rejected by other groups as well. The rejection of 'feminine' for this male group was expected, as it has been shown elsewhere (Gaudreau, 1977) that 'feminine' and 'masculine' are indicative of the sex of the respondent only.

The items which were rated as "occasionally true/usually not true" were 'yielding' and 'flatterable'. It is surprising that the "occasionally true" point received such a strong response because these are not strongly positive feminine characteristics or part of the 'expressive' dimension.

Of the items which were not significant across the three rating points using Chi-square, 'shy' and 'does not use harsh language' failed to be rated significantly for any of the four BSRI groups. The "non-discriminating" items for the 'masculine' male group were all feminine items.

The self-description data from the 'feminine' females are shown in Table 20. Of the 18 items which were rated as "usually true" for this group, 14 were feminine and 3 masculine. These items present a picture of the traditional 'feminine stereotype', though it is a positive one, due in part to the fact that only 'socially desirable' items were said to be incorporated in the BSRI (Bem, 1974) and in part to a general consensus on dismissal of those negatively oriented feminine items such as 'gullible'.[14]

The 'feminine' female group rated the masculine items, 'individualistic', 'self-sufficient' and 'willing to take a stand' equally strongly as "usually true" and "occasionally true". Furthermore, the group rated as "occasionally true", the items 'had leadership abilities' (37.3%) and 'competitive' (42.4%), although the "usually not true" pole received strong support too. So five further masculine items were rated by a strong percentage of the group to be representative of them.

---

[14]The statement that the BSRI contains only 'socially desirable' characteristics can be seriously questioned when items such as 'gullible', 'childlike' and 'shy' are considered. The general rejection of these items and of perhaps 'athletic' may indicate negative associations with them.

However, of the eight items rejected as "usually not true", six were masculine. These items differed from those included in the self-description in that they were the 'hard' masculine characteristics, such as, 'dominant', 'forceful' and 'aggressive'. Again 'gullible' and 'childlike' were the feminine rejected items, as in the 'masculine' male results.

The "non-discriminating" masculine items were not the 'hard' group of masculine characteristics, but were related to the group rated as "occasionally/usually true", for example, 'self-sufficient' and 'willing to take a stand'. The feminine items which were not rated significantly were 'shy' and 'gullible', as for the 'masculine' male group.

In general, then, the 'masculine' males and 'feminine' females did emerge with traditionally oriented self-descriptions, although they were not as 'stereotyped' as may be indicated by the label 'masculine' or 'feminine'.

The Non sex-typed groups: Androgynous and Undifferentiated males and females.

Table 21 presents the self-descriptions of the Androgynous male and female groups. For the males the Chi-square results showed that this group rated 29 items to be "usually true" or characteristic of them. As can be seen, 15 of these were masculine and 14 feminine items. There were only three characteristics which were rated as "occasionally/usually true", 'yielding', 'athletic', and 'acts as a leader', so a total of 32 items were used for the 'androgynous' male self-description.

The items which were rated as "usually not true" were

'feminine', 'childlike', and 'gullible', and 5 items were "non-discriminating", among them again 'shy' and 'does not use harsh language'. The other 3 items which were rejected were the 3 'hard' masculine items, 'forceful', 'dominant', and 'aggressive'.

For the female 'androgynous' group, 27 items were rated as "usually true": 14 of these were feminine and 13 were masculine. The items which were "occasionally/usually true" included 'yielding' (F) and 'acts as a leader' (M), as did the 'androgynous' male self-description, but the female group also included 'forceful' and 'aggressive', which were the 'hard' masculine adjectives.

As expected, items "usually not true" were 'masculine' and, again, 'childlike'. The items which were "non-discriminating" included 'shy' and 'does not use harsh language', as did the other groups discussed so far, and 'dominant' as did the male 'androgynous' group description. 'Flatterable' and 'gullible' were not rejected as "usually not true" but were not significant across the three rating points.

The androgynous females rated the same adjectives as usually true of themselves as did the androgynous males, with the exception of 'feminine' and 'masculine'. The androgynous males also included 'flatterable' and 'has leadership abilities'. This means that the androgynous individuals rated most characteristics which indicated strength, capability and expressiveness as descriptive of their personalities. They appear as socially desirable 'super-people'. They also appear

as having a very clear and definite self-description.

The 'undifferentiated' groups, however, present a different 'self', as is seen in Table 22. The number of items which both males and females rated as "usually true" were few (7 and 5 respectively), and three of these were the same for males and females. Items which were rated as "occasionally true" for both groups were 'yielding', 'assertive' and 'analytical', and the female group also rated 'willing to take risks'. A further 5 items for males and 11 items for females were rated as "occasionally/usually true", and included independent and expressive characteristics, for example, 'self-sufficient', 'understanding' and 'gentle'. The characteristic 'childlike' was rated as "usually not true" for both groups, as were 'masculine' for the female group and 'feminine' for the male group.

There were a large number of items in the "non-discriminating" group. These were similar for males and females, and there were 19 items for males (9 masculine and 10 feminine) and 15 for females (9 masculine and 6 feminine).

The data indicate, therefore, that the 'undifferentiated' groups did not show a unified, clear, and definite self-description, which was characteristic of the androgynous group responses. Responses for the 'undifferentiated' groups were spread over the three rating points or between two points for many items, and few items were rated as true or not true in the self-descriptions. There are a number of possible explanations for these results.

Firstly, the results give some evidence that the scale may

in fact be tapping a response set. 'Androgynous' people generally responded at the ends of the rating scale. They tended to show strong consensus and have definite ideas on characteristics, and very few items had responses evenly distributed over the three rating points. The 'undifferentiated' people had response patterns such that they rated the middle category, or more generally, their responses were spread over the three rating points: 19 items for males and 15 for females. In this sense they were truly 'undifferentiated'.

The median-split method of analysis ensures that 'androgynous' people are those who score above the masculinity and femininity medians and they do this because of their continuous extreme responding on both masculine and feminine items. The undifferentiated people lie below the medians because of their middle-score responding and the fluctuations in their patterns over items. Differences in response patterns alone may lead to respondents being labelled as androgynous or undifferentiated.

Alternatively, these responses may indicate that the androgynous person <u>does</u> have a definite set of masculine and feminine characteristics in her or his self-description while the undifferentiated person does not. If this is so, serious consideration must be given to whether the androgynous individual is really the flexible, readily adjusted person she or he is portrayed as. There is a tendency to view the androgynous person as positive and mentally healthy (Bem, 1975) but it may be that on this scale the undifferentiated individuals are the people most readily adaptable. If they are less likely to

define themselves as definitely having a certain set of characteristics, they may be more flexible and adaptable. Furthermore, studies using the Semantic Differential indicate that psychiatric patients are more likely to be extreme responders than non-psychiatric people (Parsonson, 1969a). So people who are not extreme responders on the BSRI (the undifferentiated group) may be mentally healthier. On the BSRI then it may be the undifferentiated people who fit more closely the androgynous definition.

5.3.2 A note on the limitations of the BSRI

The previous discussion on item responses for the androgynous and undifferentiated groups raises the question of whether the BSRI is an adequate measure of androgyny. The original purpose of the inventory was to provide a means of categorizing people as either Masculine, Feminine or Androgynous (Bem, 1974) and later as Undifferentiated (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975). But the proposal of the median-split method as an alternative to the original 't' ratio method (Bem 1977; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) may not have been an improvement as indicated in section 5.2.1., as it forces people into the four categories in an artificial manner. This is, firstly, because scores tend to cluster around the median of the mean scores and an individual classified as 'feminine' may have very similar scores to one classified as 'androgynous'. Secondly, because the median is determined independently for each sample studied, the percentage of people in each group is limited and will be similar across different samples.

However, when the item responses were considered in this study, significantly different self-descriptions were found for the four groups, lending some support to the method of differentiation. Furthermore, Bem's experimental and behavioural data tend to corroborate these group differences. She found, for example, that the undifferentiated people differed from androgynous individuals on a number of points: they were significantly lower in self esteem, they were less responsive to a kitten, and were less responsive to a 5 year old baby (Bem, 1977). Bem (1977) also found that when she removed the undifferentiated individuals from her independence study, her original findings were more strongly supported.

Yet some of Bem's findings have not been clear-cut. The results for women are often complex and do not always fit the expected pattern; for example, although Bem found the feminine women to behave in some traditional ways, such as yielding to the pressures of conformity, she found that they did not initiate play with a kitten and were not particularly nurturant with an infant (Bem, 1975). As Deaux (1976) comments, Bem has not found unambiguous support for the connection between androgyny and behaviour, but she notes that this is not unusual in the early stages of research.

One reason for the behavioural studies was to make a link between androgyny and greater behavioural flexibility. Bem (1974) hypothesised that androgynous individuals were better adjusted mentally and behaviourally because of their flexibility in varying situations. It is not that sex-typed traits are

pathological in themselves (Kaplan, 1976). But when the two extremes of masculinity and femininity are overly sex-typed reactions, or represent the complete absence of opposite-sex characteristics, they become rigid behaviour patterns which may be limiting, inflexible, maladaptive and dysfunctional for the individual. Bem (1976) writes that "limiting a person's ability to respond in one or other of these two complementary domains thus seems tragically and unnecessarily destructive of human potential" (p.50). Sex role stereotyping for women has been shown, for example, to correlate with high anxiety, low self-esteem and low social acceptance (Consentino & Heilbrun, 1964; Gall, 1969; Gray, 1957).

When they confronted this issue Jones, Chernovetz, and Hansson (1978) noted that although Bem's studies were "creative" they "did not adequately test a range of competencies sufficient to justify the conclusion that androgynous persons are behaviourally and emotionally more adaptable" (p.229). Jones et al. (1978) tested subjects with respect to attitudes to women's issues, gender identification, neurosis, introversion - extraversion, locus of control, self-esteem, problems with alcohol, creativity, political awareness, confidence in one's own ability, helplessness and sexual maturity. They found partial support for Bem's theory of androgyny. But their results contradicted predictions arising from her theory in two ways.

Firstly, the 'androgyny equals adaptability' theory was not supported for males. "In no case were androgynous males found to be significantly more adaptive, flexible or competent

than masculine males" (p.310). The pattern which emerged for males indicated that the masculine male was more competent and confident on a number of dimensions, while the less traditional sex-typed males were more limited and restricted, less effective, more vulnerable to influence, less sure of themselves and "perhaps even less well adjusted".

Secondly, the results for females were more supportive of Bem's theory: androgynous women were "less conventional, more outgoing, politically aware, creative, heterosexually active, and less awkward, (and) shy". They were less sensitive to criticism than were feminine females. However the masculine females were more adaptive, more competent, more extroverted and more feminist in their attitudes than the androgynous females. Jones et al. (1978) comment that "the more masculine in orientation, the more adaptive, competent and secure the feminine subject was" (p.310). Indeed sex-typed males and opposite sex-typed females (the masculine groups) appeared as the most flexible individuals with the most competent pattern of responses.

However, the problem encountered in Bem's study and in Jones et al.'s results may be related, not to the behaviour of these four groups of people, but to the method by which they were differentiated into their groups in the first place. Deaux (1976) writes that the problem may "lie in Bem's conception of androgyny" (p.141) and this is possibly true. In her original conceptualization, Bem defined the androgynous

individuals as people who showed little difference in their masculinity and femininity scores, that is, they had described themselves with a similar number of masculine and feminine characteristics. But the arguments against the difference method of scoring the BSRI seemed strong (Strahan, 1975; Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975) especially when there was the problem of a possible difference between low-low and high-high scorers. Discussing this question, Jones et al. (1978) also comment that the median-split or "additive" method of scoring may define androgyny in such a way that it may be self-esteem and not androgyny which is being measured.

The androgynous individual has now become the person who rates him or herself strongly on both masculine and feminine characteristics. But is this the type of person whom Bem first envisaged as androgynous and whom the literature praises as flexible and healthy? It is possible that the BSRI has been instrumental in constricting an essentially flexible concept. The inventory now fails to portray the original conceptualization of the androgynous person, and limits androgyny so that it is as easily defined as masculinity and femininity.

Furthermore, there appears to be no logical reason why the androgynous person should be classified as a high-high scorer on the BSRI rather than a low-low scorer. As suggested in the discussion earlier (section 5.3.1.) the 'undifferentiated' people could in fact be the androgynous group. These people failed to define themselves strongly: they may hold their behaviour to be flexible enough to change depending on the situation in which they are involved.

The definition of androgyny in the literature supports this view. Kaplan and Bean (1976) note that when they use the word 'androgynous' they mean "flexibility of sex role" (p.2). Their discussion of androgyny is similar to Bem's (1974) and they write that the androgynous people are able to behave in "integrative feminine and masculine ways"; they are "assertive and yielding, independent and dependent, expressive and instrumental" (p.2). This could describe both the androgynous and undifferentiated groups as defined on the BSRI. However, Kaplan and Bean elaborate this point by explaining that they

> do not mean by androgyny a union of extreme masculine and extreme feminine qualities: a dependent aggressive person is not androgynous. For us, androgyny includes masculine and feminine traits but moves beyond these to a third integrated dimension that is influenced by individual differences across situations over a life-time (p.2-3).

Kaplan indicates that for her the androgynous model of mental health "requires that behaviours at both extremes be brought to a more reasonable, modulated, middle ground" (p.356). Again this definition applies more appropriately to the undifferentiated group.

A possible reason why high-high scorers are labelled as 'androgynous' may lie in the attitudes of researchers who often describe this group as the positive, socially desirable model, having both positive masculine and feminine characteristics. Forisha (1978) exemplifies this point. Her description of the androgynous person is similar to that of Kaplan and Bean (1976). But she also writes:

> it is possible that androgynous, process-oriented individuals experience their inner conflicts more deeply than other individuals. They are more aware of themselves and others and know what is going on both inside and outside themselves. They respond, perhaps more *authentically* (my italics), to the pain of the human condition, although at the same time they also experience a more profound satisfaction and delight in living than others (p.101)

With this fashionable attitude towards the androgynous person there is concurrently a growing prejudice towards the 'undifferentiated' person who is discarded as 'wishy-washy', or difficult to explain within the neat context of masculinity, femininity and androgyny. After all, what can be said about a person who does not appear to define him or herself?

But this argument over whether the androgynous or undifferentiated BSRI individuals are the true androgynes serves really to highlight the limitations of the BSRI. The scale has scoring problems (outlined previously) but it also remains basically an adjective check-list type of questionnaire. However, definitions of androgyny which emerge in the literature continually emphasise the point that the androgynous person is <u>situationally</u> flexible.

Deaux (1976) notes the sense of viewing people as being able to "combine masculine and feminine traits and be free to use either type *according to the situation*" (p.141, my italics). Bem herself writes that the androgynous individual can be "both masculine and feminine, both instrumental and expressive, both agentic and communal, depending upon the *situational appropriateness* of these various modalities" (Bem, 1976, my italics).

The BSRI does not, then, fulfil the requirements of the literature in its definition of the androgynous individual. The static check list procedure would probably mask the truly androgynous person, depending upon what behaviour she or he felt was situationally relevant. The question is: can androgyny be adequately assessed by this type of scale? The reply appears to be in the negative.

Writers have defined androgynous people as being basically flexible in their behaviour. They can exhibit that behaviour which they feel the situation calls for and which is appropriate for them. This type of situationally relevant behaviour cannot be measured by a scale such as the BSRI, and although there have been attempts to assess androgyny behaviourally (Bem, 1976), these findings have been inconclusive (Deaux, 1976). This is possibly because groups of subjects were initially defined as androgynous or non-androgynous by the BSRI or a similar instrument. It would perhaps be more useful to define subjects as androgynous or otherwise solely on the basis of behaviour.

Essentially it seems that the concept of the androgynous person is a useful one, particularly if, as Kaplan and Bean (1976) suggest, it means a "transcending of sex-roles" (p.6). But the essential qualities of the androgynous person seem to have been lost in the reduction of a flexible individual to a <u>definition</u> with a limited set of adjectives.

This problem is currently of primary importance because a great number of studies use these scales (notably the BSRI) as

the basis for further defining and discussing androgyny (for example, Berzins et al., 1978; Hansson, Chernovetz, and Jones, 1977; Jones et al., 1978; Talbo, 1977; Wiggins and Holzmuller, 1978). Thus a large body of data is being accumulated on what may be a dubious base. Furthermore, as Bem's initial conceptualization of androgyny claimed that it represented a mentally healthier person than the sex-typed individual, the concept is emerging in the clinical context relevant to behaviour change.

Winkler (1977), in a criticism of a case which used reinforcement procedures to treat a five year old boy for cross-sex behaviour, commented that behaviour change programmes should consider Bem's concept of the mentally healthy androgynous person. He wrote:

> Ability to behave in both 'masculine' and 'feminine' ways according to the demands of different situations would seem a more desirable goal than strengthening only one type of sex role behaviour (p.551).

Although a laudable goal, this is like Bem's statement of "situational appropriateness" in that it will be difficult for clinicians to define 'appropriate' behaviour, particularly when it is no longer sex-typed. For example, in Bem's study with a kitten (Bem, 1975) it would surely be impossible to determine "appropriate" behaviour for the androgynous person, assuming that his or her behaviour would be motivated by what she or he felt was appropriate <u>for him or her</u> at that particular time. Deaux (1976) makes a similar point when she questions:

> What kind of predictions could we make, for example, in a situation where either a masculine or feminine response may be appropriate? (p.141).

Extending this point about situational flexibility, Rebecca, Hefner, and Oleshansky (1976) suggest an alternative to the androgyny conceptualization. In a developmental framework they see sex-role development in the future as moving toward a stage of sex-role transcendence. They feel this framework would be personally relevant and write of it as "flexibility (over time, over situation and over personal moods), plurality, personal choice, and the development of new or emergent possibilities..." (p.95). For these authors this stage needs to go beyond situational flexibility, because situational demands often call for behaviour which compromises personal integrity.

Rebecca et al. (1976) move further away from a conceptualization based on past sex role stereotypes. Bem's concept is, in fact, still based on traditional divisions as it contains basic stereotyped elements. Bernard (1975) quotes Hefner and Nordin (1974) as stating that: "the popular use [of the term 'Androgyny'] puts too much emphasis on polarity combined instead of polarity transcended" (p.46). Even in a period of "revolutionary science", as described by Kuhn (1970) and discussed by Hefner, Rebecca, and Oleshansky (1975), the new creative theories are often at the mercy of entrenched terminology and concepts. Thus Bem's concept of androgyny is based essentially on the traditional conceptions of masculinity and femininity: a polarity combined. Alternatively, Rebecca et al. (1976) suggest a polarity transcended and conceive of their transcendent stage of sex role development as dynamic

not static, involving continual conflict and conflict resolution. They conclude:

> Given the diversity of situations a person encounters (some of which lend themselves to assertive, independent behaviours, and some of which lend themselves to expressive, nurturant, co-operative behaviours) that person will have to synchronize the particular situational expectations and personal inclinations and abilities (p.96).

With respect to androgyny then, this concept of transcendence takes situationally relevant behaviour and extends it to personally/situationally relevant behaviour. In this sense it may be more useful both to developmental theory and clinical practice, but it provides further difficulties for the empirical researcher.

The concept of androgyny is an appealing one with its portrayal of a flexible well-adjusted individual; however, the gulf between the definition of the concept and its use in research is widening. The BSRI itself is partly at fault, limiting as it does the definition of androgyny to a set of specific characteristics; and this scale unfortunately forms the basis of much current research, both social and clinical, into androgyny. Discussing problems with the validity of the scale, Hogan (1977) writes: "the promising potential of the BSRI as a measure of the clinically and socially interesting dimension of androgyny appears to remain largely unfulfilled" (p.1013). Alternative methods of investigation may lie in behavioural studies or even in situationally relevant questionnaire studies. It is worth considering, though, that unless the area is approached with caution, androgyny may effectively become the third sex-role stereotype.

Chapter Six Results and Discussion:

Attitude to Sex Roles Questionnaire (ASRQ)

6.1 Results: Factor analysis and item-total correlations.

6.1.1 Discussion

6.2 Results: Total scores and item responses on the ASRQ.

6.2.1 Discussion

6.3 Summary comments on the ASRQ results.

6.3.1 The implications of change in sex roles.

Before the role hypothesis (4) that, women are more liberal in their attitudes toward sex roles than are men, was tested, the ASRQ was factor analysed. This was carried out in order to ascertain if the scale was unifactorial. If it was not, then the total score on the ASRQ would be only a superficial measure of an attitude to sex roles. Item-total correlations were also computed as an indication of internal consistency.

6.1 Results: Factor analysis and item-total correlations.

The ASRQ was factor analysed using the principal axis method. Factors with eigen values greater than one were then rotated using varimax rotation.[15] Analysis was conducted for both sexes separately.

The results for males indicated 9 factors after rotation. The first three were meaningful factors which accounted for 72 percent of the variance. These three factors are presented in Table 23 with the ASRQ items which loaded significantly (≥ 0.30). The eigen values for each item are shown as well as whether the item was a male or female role oriented question, or a question related to both roles.

Results for the females indicated 10 factors after rotation. The first four factors accounted for 74.7 percent of the variance. These results are presented in Table 24. In both tables, items which did not have eigen values of 0.30 or above on any factor, are also presented.

---

[15]The Statistics Package for the Social Sciences was utilised.

Table 23

The three factors for males, extracted from the ASRQ after varimax rotation.

Factor 1 (47% of variance): Work & Politics

Item	Role-Orientation	Loading
5	F	.73
4	F	.63
6	F	.58
28	M	.55
13	F	.51
7	M/F	.48
12	M	.41
2	F	.36
19	M/F	.35
20	M/F	.33
29	M	.31

Factor 2 (13.7% of variance): Leadership & equality

20	M/F	.72
8	M	.59
19	M/F	.57
29	M	.54
30	M/F	.47
17	M/F	.47
33	M/F	.39
27	M/F	.39
7	M/F	.38
14	M	.34
1	F	.30

Factor 3 (11.2% of variance): Equality & Sharing

Item	Role-Orientation	Loading
11	F	.65
14	M	.57
15	F	.56
33	M/F	.52
1	F	.42
25	F	.33
26	M/F	.33

Items not included in the first three factors.

3F	22 M
9M	23 F
10M	24 M/F
16M	31 M/F
18M/F	32 M
21M	

Table 24

The four factors for females, extracted from the ASRQ after varimax rotation.

Factor 1 (48.5% of variance): Work roles

Item	Role-orientation	Loading
6	F	.72
4	F	.64
5	F	.60
7	M/F	.57
17	M/F	.55
2	F	.41
13	F	.35
28	M	.33
20	M/F	.32

Factor 2 (11.3% of variance): Equality and Sharing

1	F	.61
15	F	.60
14	M	.57
32	M	.47
8	M	.41
17	M/F	.38
26	M/F	.33

Factor 3 (8.0% of variance): Freedom of choice

Item	Role-orientation	Loading
24	M/F	.66
25	F	.59
27	M/F	.58
21	M	.45
2	F	.44
23	F	.35
11	F	.35
10	M	.34
12	M	.32

Factor 4 (6.9% of variance): Male dominance

20	M/F	.69
29	M	.60
30	M/F	.57
7	M/F	.36
13	F	.33

Items not included in the first four factors.

3F	19 M/F
9M	22 M
16M	33 M/F
18M/F	

For males, item-total correlations of all items with the total score were significant at the $p<0.01$ level with the exception of the following three questions:

3. A woman should not consider her own needs more than her family's when taking a job.
22. Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.
23. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expenses when they go out together.

For females, the results were all significant at the $p<0.01$ level except for question 3. The item total correlations for both males and females on the ASRQ are shown in Table 25.

Table 25

Item-total correlations between the items of the ASRQ and the total score are presented for males and females.

Item	Males	Females	Item	Males	Females
1	0.51	0.51	20	0.71	0.66
2	0.63	0.55	21	0.38	0.43
3	0.04	0.21	22	0.04	0.33
4	0.59	0.65	23	0.09	0.37
5	0.48	0.53	24	0.44	0.55
6	0.60	0.70	25	0.50	0.55
7	0.63	0.61	26	0.45	0.40
8	0.39	0.35	27	0.62	0.52
9	0.28	0.36	28	0.44	0.53
10	0.38	0.49	29	0.64	0.63
11	0.50	0.40	30	0.42	0.57
12	0.37	0.57	31	0.45	0.35
13	0.49	0.62	32	0.27	0.42
14	0.59	0.47	33	0.65	0.42
15	0.45	0.50			
16	0.31	0.37			
17	0.49	0.55			
18	0.25	0.34			
19	0.57	0.57			

6.1.1 Discussion: Factor analysis and item-total correlations.

As Table 23 shows, three meaningful factors emerged from the male sample's data after rotation. The first factor contained questions related to work roles and politics and could be labelled a Work & Politics factor. The questions were primarily concerned with the possibility of a work role for women.

The second factor contained questions relating to community leadership and equality of opportunity; it was labelled Leadership and Equality. The third factor, Equality and Sharing, included questions on sharing, equality and the development of individual potential.

Results from the female sample's data indicated four factors (see Table 24). The first factor included questions related to work roles and opportunities, particularly for women, and could be labelled Work roles. The second factor, Equality and Sharing, was similar to the male factor three, and contained questions on equality and the sharing of responsibility and freedom. The third factor concerned freedom and equality of opportunity - Freedom of choice - and was a liberally oriented factor, while the fourth factor was a conservative Male Dominance factor.

The results of the factor analysis of the ASRQ were unsatisfactory, however, in a number of ways. Firstly, the factors were not as clearly delineated as their labels imply. Secondly, as shown in Tables 23 and 24, some questions were unrelated to the major factors. These items were mainly

male-oriented (6 for males; 3 for females) or mixed-role oriented questions (3 for males; 3 for females), and five of them were common to both male and female groups.

One explanation for the failure of male role items to load on the major factors is that, although the female role questions may be viewed as connected to each other and to a central issue of 'women's liberation', male role questions are not similarly connected. Thus while people may have developed an integrated attitude to women's roles, they may not have developed an integrated attitude to men's roles.

Mason, Czajka, and Arber (1976) commented on this inter-relatedness of women's role questions in their comprehensive analysis of women's responses to five surveys concerning these attitudes, from 1964 to 1974. They concluded that over that period "women's attitudes toward their roles in the home had become increasingly related to their attitudes toward their rights in the labour market" (p.593). The authors felt that this change may have been due to the impact of the Women's Movement or to "shifts in the objective status and roles of the sexes" (p.593).

But from the data in the present study, it seems unlikely that a similar clustering of male role related issues has occurred. The problems of the rigidity and restrictiveness of the male role (Farrell, 1974) have not been widely discussed and publicised, and therefore there is no coherence of attitude towards the 'male role'. Tomeh (1978) makes the point that women's role in society has been the central issue

in the women's movement and only recently have men's roles received any attention.

A third problem with the results was that many questions loaded significantly on more than one factor, implying a relationship between factors as well as between items. This also added to the difficulty in labelling factors.

The factor structure of the ASRQ is not, then, unifactorial as Spence and Helmreich (1972) claim the Attitude to Women Scale (AWS) to be. However, it is not as multi-factorial as the Cohen and Burdsal (1978) questionnaire. Using a 54 item questionnaire on Attitudes to Women's roles, they found 16 factors underlying married women's attitudes. Both of these studies were, notably, dealing only with women's role.

The factors which emerged in the present study did not provide clear and useful categorizations, and illustrate the need for item-response analysis rather than sole utilization of a total score. Discussing this point with respect to the AWS, Law (1976) noted that his results led to a multi-factored interpretation of the scale. He suggested that the factor structure may not have been stable owing to response bias. He too concluded that a total score might not be a reliable indicator of a general attitude.

Item-total correlations

The results for the item-total correlations (Table 25) indicate that question 3 was not related to a total attitude to sex role score for males or females. Questions 22 and 23 did not correlate significantly with the total for men either

and both are concerned with financial dependence-independence for women. They are both liberally worded questions and suggest a less burdensome financial role for men. These questions could be dropped from the scale as independent of a general attitude to sex roles, if a total score only is used.

The results in the following section are related to the hypothesis that:

> Women are more liberal in their attitudes toward sex roles than are men.

Studies which employ scales like the ASRQ usually deal with total scores to obtain an indication of the attitude trend, that is, whether the sample is liberal or conservative[16] (Hjelle & Butterfield, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1972 and Stanley, Boots & Johnson, 1975). Thus, initially, total ASRQ scores were computed as well as sub-totals for the male role, female role and mixed role related questions.

6.2 Results: Total scores and item responses on the ASRQ.

Male and female total ASRQ scores were compared using 't' tests. Table 26 presents the mean scores, 't' values and significance level for each group of questions. A significant difference was found between the male and female responses for the total scores and the male role, female role and mixed

---

[16] See footnote 6 p.51 for definitions of these terms.

role questions.

The data were further analysed according to item responses. A one-variable Chi-square was computed across the four response points. Then frequencies were collapsed, for ease of discussion, to an 'agree' or 'disagree' pole. A 2 x 2 Chi-square was utilised to determine possible sex differences and then a Chi-square was computed on the frequencies at each pole, for males and females separately. Table 27 presents the percentages on each of the four rating points. The sex role orientation of the question is indicated as well as whether there were significant differences in responses across the four rating points and between the two collapsed poles. The results indicate significant differences on a majority of items and these need to be considered in detail.

As a summary of the liberal and conservative responses to each item, Table 28 presents the fields of interest of the ASRQ with: the sex role orientation of each question, whether the response was liberal, conservative, or non-discriminating[17] for males and females, and whether there was a significant sex difference on each item. Table 29 simplifies the data to show liberal, conservative or non-discriminating responses for each sex over the total ASRQ questions and over the male role, female role and mixed role questions. These results indicate a large number of liberal responses and very few conservative responses, for both samples.

---

[17]A 'non-discriminating' response indicates that there was no significant difference between the two poles using Chi-square.

Table 26

The mean, standard deviation, 't' value, and significance level are presented for males and females, for each group of questions on the ASRQ.

	Male mean	Female mean	t value	Significance
Total ASRQ	87.74	100.74	7.20	<0.001
Standard deviation	15.41	15.94		
Male role questions	27.50	31.87	7.08	<0.001
Standard deviation	5.10	5.60		
Female role questions	28.10	32.23	5.96	<0.001
Standard deviation	5.97	6.06		
Mixed role questions	32.14	36.64	6.18	<0.001
Standard deviation	6.73	5.94		

Table 27

Percentages of males and females on the four rating points of the ASRQ. The role-orientation of the question is indicated as well as significant differences across the four points and between the two poles.

Item		Agree Strongly	Agree Mildly	Disagree Mildly	Disagree Strongly	Significance Across 4 Points	Significance between poles
Males	1(F)	39.6	33.1	13.0	14.3	0.001	0.001
Females		55.5	36.3	6.2	2.1	0.001	0.001
Males	2(F)	27.3	31.8	18.2	22.7	N.S.	N.S.
Females		49.3	33.6	9.6	7.5	0.001	0.001
Males	3(F)	44.2	27.3	16.9	11.7	0.001	0.001
Females		28.8	33.6	27.4	10.3	0.001	0.01
Males	4(F)	41.6	26.6	17.5	14.3	0.001	0.001
Females		19.3	23.4	29.0	28.3	N.S.	N.S.
Males	5(F)	49.0	27.5	9.8	13.7	0.001	0.001
Females		31.5	27.4	21.2	19.9	N.S.	N.S.
Males	6(F)	18.2	27.9	22.7	31.2	N.S.	N.S.
Females		6.8	12.3	27.4	53.4	0.001	0.001
Males	7(M/F)	32.5	20.1	18.8	28.6	N.S.	N.S.
Females		16.4	7.5	17.8	58.2	0.001	0.001
Males	8(M)	22.1	18.8	22.7	36.4	N.S.	N.S.
Females		4.8	4.8	17.1	73.3	0.001	0.001
Males	9(M)	13.6	24.7	27.3	34.4	0.01	0.01
Females		10.3	15.8	39.7	34.2	0.001	0.001
Males	10(M)	10.5	16.3	22.9	50.3	0.001	0.001
Females		15.2	28.3	19.3	37.2	0.001	N.S.
Males	11(F)	30.7	31.4	20.3	17.6	N.S.	0.01
Females		48.3	24.1	20.0	7.6	0.001	0.001
Males	12(M)	24.7	27.3	28.6	19.5	N.S.	N.S.
Females		6.2	12.4	36.6	44.8	0.001	0.001
Males	13(F)	35.1	33.8	17.5	13.6	0.001	0.001
Females		28.1	17.8	20.5	33.6	N.S.	N.S.
Males	14(M)	46.4	37.9	7.2	8.5	0.001	0.001
Females		65.8	23.3	4.1	6.8	0.001	0.001
Males	15(F)	64.9	25.3	8.4	1.3	0.001	0.001
Females		88.4	10.3	1.4	-	-	-

(Table 27 cont.)

Item		AS	AM	DM	DS	Significance across 4 Points	Significance Between Poles
Males	16(M)	24.7	26.0	31.2	18.2	N.S.	N.S.
Females		12.4	15.9	29.0	42.8	0.001	0.001
Males	17(M/F)	14.6	31.8	29.1	24.5	N.S.	N.S.
Females		8.3	14.6	24.3	52.8	0.001	0.001
Males	18(M/F)	39.9	22.9	18.3	19.0	0.001	0.01
Females		60.7	17.2	5.5	16.6	0.001	0.001
Males	19(M/F)	33.3	18.3	21.6	26.8	N.S.	N.S.
Females		15.2	9.7	31.0	44.1	0.001	0.001
Males	20(M/F)	29.4	20.9	24.2	25.5	N.S.	N.S.
Females		12.3	15.1	24.0	48.6	0.001	0.001
Males	21(M)	18.2	31.2	19.5	31.2	N.S.	N.S.
Females		15.1	34.2	20.5	30.1	0.01	N.S.
Males	22(M)	60.4	24.0	7.8	7.8	0.001	0.001
Females		47.3	29.5	12.3	11.0	0.001	0.001
Males	23(F)	38.3	29.2	14.9	17.5	0.001	0.001
Females		27.4	37.0	23.3	12.3	0.001	0.001
Males	24(M/F)	50.7	27.6	13.8	7.9	0.001	0.001
Females		47.3	34.2	14.4	4.1	0.001	0.001
Males	25(F)	26.1	34.6	22.9	16.3	N.S.	0.01
Females		37.0	28.8	23.3	11.0	0.001	0.001
Males	26(M/F)	79.6	11.8	5.3	3.3	0.001	0.001
Females		89.7	8.9	-	1.4	-	-
Males	27(M/F)	43.1	31.4	13.1	12.4	0.001	0.001
Females		67.8	23.3	4.1	4.8	0.001	0.001
Males	28(M)	69.5	18.2	5.8	6.5	0.001	0.001
Females		45.2	32.2	14.4	8.2	0.001	0.001
Males	29(M)	35.1	23.4	24.7	16.9	N.S.	N.S.
Females		13.8	15.2	29.0	42.1	0.001	0.001
Males	30(M/F)	19.0	27.5	15.0	38.6	0.001	N.S.
Females		8.2	8.9	19.2	63.7	0.001	0.001
Males	31(M/F)	69.9	22.9	5.2	2.0	0.001	0.001
Females		74.5	20.0	0.7	4.8	0.001	0.001
Males	32(M)	24.0	22.7	26.0	27.3	N.S.	N.S.
Females		6.8	10.3	27.4	55.5	0.001	0.001
Males	33(M/F)	59.1	22.1	11.0	7.8	0.001	0.001
Females		69.2	19.9	5.5	5.5	0.001	0.001

Table 28

ASRQ questions are presented with an indication of whether responses were liberal (L), conservative (C) or non-discriminating (ND). The significance of the difference between male and female responses using Chi-square is also shown.

Item	Role orientation	Women	Men	Sex difference
Household duties:				
9	M	L	L	N.S.
14	M	L	L	N.S.
6	F	L	ND	0.001
Children:				
5	F	N.D.	C	0.01
26	M/F	L	L	N.S.
24	M/F	L	L	N.S.
Divorce:				
31	M/F	L	L	N.S.
22	M	L	L	N.S.
18	M/F	L	L	N.S.
Emotional support:				
16	M	L	N.D.	0.001
21	M	N.D.	N.D.	N.S.
Sexual Freedom:				
11	F	L	L	N.S.
8	M	L	N.D.	0.001
Work roles:				
2	F	L	N.D.	0.001
3	F	C	C	N.S.
4	F	N.D.	C	0.001
10	M	N.D.	C	0.01
12	M	L	N.D.	0.001
13	F	N.D.	C	0.001
25	F	L	L	N.S.
Job equality and equality of opportunity:				
27	M/F	L	L	0.001
33	M/F	L	L	N.S.
7	M/F	L	N.D.	0.001
19	M/F	L	N.D.	0.001
30	M/F	L	N.D.	0.001
15	F	L	L	N.S.
32	M	L	N.D.	0.001
Economic roles:				
23	F	L	L	N.S.
17	M/F	L	N.D.	0.001
28	M	C	C	N.S.
Political roles:				
20	M/F	L	N.D.	0.001
1	F	L	L	0.001
29	M	L	N.D.	0.001

Table 29

The number of liberal (L), conservative (C) and non-discriminating (ND) responses for the female role, male role and mixed role questions are indicated.

	Female role	Male role	Mixed	Total
Women	L = 7	L = 8	L = 11	L = 26
	C = 1	C = 1	C = 0	C = 2
	ND = 3	ND = 2	ND = 0	ND = 5
Men	L = 5	L = 4	L = 6	L = 15
	C = 4	C = 1	C = 0	C = 5
	ND = 2	ND = 6	ND = 5	ND = 13

6.2.1 Discussion: Total scores and item responses on the ASRQ.

General results.

Results for the total ASRQ questions (Table 26) indicated a more liberal orientation for the female sample compared with the male sample, and the sex difference was significant ($p<0.001$). The hypothesis that women are more liberal than men in their attitudes to sex roles was therefore supported. The women were also more liberal than the men on the male-role, female-role and mixed-role questions ($p<0.001$). The finding that male attitudes were more traditional than female attitudes has been reported in other studies which concentrated on attitudes to 'women's role' (Etaugh & Gerson, 1974; Lunneborg, 1974; Spence & Helmreich, 1972). These studies sampled American college student populations. But in a study in Finland, Haavio-Mannila (1972) questioned 1,000 people from Helsinki, two small towns, and five rural communities. She found that Finnish women in all groups were more egalitarian in their attitudes to sex roles than were the men.

In one of the few studies which attempted to assess attitudes to both female and male roles, Tomeh (1978) designed a Sex Role Orientation questionnaire and tested a sample of 642 college students. Tomeh found that in the three dimensions of sex role orientation tested, both males and females took a "moderate non-traditional position". But within this moderation, "almost all the attitudinal items elicited a significantly more modern response from females than from males" (p.351).

Previous studies have, therefore, found male subjects to be less liberal than female subjects, and findings from the present study are consistent with this. As argued in 6.1.1, however, a more meaningful approach is to examine item responses. The item analysis results contained in tables 25, 26 and 27 will now be discussed.

Item response analysis of the ASRQ.

Household duties (questions 6, 9 and 14). A significant number of men and women disagreed with the suggestion that men would not be capable of learning to run a home and cook a meal (Q9). (The male response was not as strongly differentiated ($p=0.01$) as the female response).

Both men and women agreed that men should share the household tasks, such as washing the dishes and doing the laundry (Q.14). There were no sex differences on these two items.

The percentage of men (84.3%) who agreed with the idea of sharing household tasks was high, particularly when compared with responses to a similar question in Haavio-Mannila's survey (1972). In her study she found a change over the period 1966 to 1970 in attitudes to this issue. In 1966, 21 percent (city sample) and 36 percent (rural sample) of men supported the idea while 38 percent and 50 percent (respectively) of women agreed. But by 1970 the figures had risen to nearly 80 percent for women and to about half of the sample for men. There appeared to be a trend towards increasing support for this role for men.

In their discussion of five surveys of sex role orientation taken between 1964 and 1974, Mason, Czajka, and Arber (1976) noted this trend too. They found that between 1970 and 1973 there were sizeable increases in the percentages of subjects (all female) endorsing "the obligations of husbands to share housework with wives". The present findings would support this trend and may indicate, as Stephenson (1970) noted, that men in Australia do not see housework as wholly the role of women.

But as Fransella and Frost (1977) comment regarding the Finnish study, the responses do not indicate the amount of housework respondents thought men should do, nor how much they did in practice. Fransella and Frost (1977) also comment that some studies find women to be more resistant than men to the idea of men doing housework, but this was not the case in the present study.

Finally, women disagreed strongly that they should be content to stay at home and do all the housework, but there was no consensus by men on whether or not women should be content with housework (Q6) (sex difference at $p<0.001$).

For this section, then, responses were on the whole liberal (see Table 28). The failure of the men to either significantly agree or disagree on the issue of 'women and housework' initially seems to contradict their support for men sharing household tasks. However, this result may be related to the 'women and work' issue, so that although men feel they should share household tasks they still feel that

women should be 'content to remain at home'. This is reflected in the Work Roles section of the questionnaire, where there was a generally conservative male response to the question of women working.

Although the result seems restrictive for women, it may also reflect a stressful position for men. They were prepared to work in an occupation outside the home as well as share household tasks. It should be noted too that, although there was no significant difference between the 'agree' and 'disagree' responses for men, almost 54 percent of them disagreed with the suggestion that women should be content with housework. If women's position in Australia has been as traditional as the literature indicates (Encel et al., 1974) then this would suggest an important attitude change.

In general, responses were less conservative than those encountered by Osmond and Martin (1975), who found strong agreement between men and women (college students) on a traditional sexual division of labour in the family. However, they do seem to support a trend discussed by Wishart (1975) as emerging in Australia, that "it is more legitimate and becoming more acceptable for the male to play a larger part in the domestic realm than it is for the female to enter the world outside on an equal basis" (p.369).

Children (questions 5, 26 and 24). The responses from women to the suggestion that having and bringing up children should be the most important thing in their lives showed an even distribution; women's responses were split between

agreement and disagreement (Q5). Men's responses were not divided, and they felt that it should be the most important thing in a woman's life. This difference (significant at the 0.01 level) may indicate a difference between women and men in the perceived fulfilment and quality of the role of mother.

Both men and women strongly agreed that parental authority and responsibility for the discipline of children should be equally divided between husband and wife (Q26). This could indicate a desire on the part of both men and women to share the unpleasant role of disciplinarian which, Farrell (1974) writes, usually falls to the man. He comments that the "tensions which develop between the mother and children during the day are placed in the lap of the father at night" (p.181).

Farrell is writing about the United States, however, and it may be that Australian family discipline and authority, with respect to children, has always been shared, or has previously been the responsibility of the mother. As Bryson (1975) notes, there is a sparsity of research on family interaction in Australia.

Both men and women also agreed that the modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy (Q24). This response indicates support for greater freedom for girls. The question itself is very general and could refer to social, educational and sexual freedom. Responses seem to endorse for girls greater

equality of opportunity with boys. (There was no sex difference on responses to questions 24 and 26).

Divorce (questions 18, 22 and 31). There were no sex differences in responses on the questions relating to divorce. Both men and women agreed strongly that husbands and wives should be allowed the same grounds for divorce (Q31). Both also agreed that divorced men should support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working (Q22).

This liberally-oriented approach to divorce suggests freedom and flexibility for both sexes. Women initially seem to lose more in this situation because they would be forced into the workforce. Alternatively, they may gain in self-esteem because of financial independence, which is often lacking in many marriages, forcing women into a similar position to that of a minor (Myrdal & Klein, 1968).

Farrell (1974) comments that support from the Women's Liberation Movement groups for the phasing out of automatic alimony payments is based on the belief that the woman's role will change to one of financial independence (p.191). However, Hogg and Lanteri (1975), in their discussion of the impending (in 1975) Family Law Bill in Australia, commented that this type of legislation assumes there is equality between men and women in the existing social structure. They point out that the woman would not be compensated for the years spent out of public life and for foregoing training while housekeeping. She would thus probably end up with an unskilled

job and child-care problems.

The issue is still controversial and unsolved, and in the present study agreement for a non-alimony situation was only endorsed if the wife was "capable of working" (in the legal sense, a difficult situation to define). However, attitudes seem to indicate a less burdensome role in divorce for men.

Women also felt strongly that the husband should not be favoured over the wife in the disposal of family income or property (Q18). Men too agreed, though not so strongly, which reflects the possibility that they feel more disadvantaged on this issue than women.

Emotional support (questions 16 and 21). Women disagreed with the view that men should not be encouraged to show their emotions and cry as women do (Q16). This response indicates that women desire emotional responses from men. It is supported by the women's description of their *Ideal Man* as 'warm', 'gentle', 'emotional' and able to 'easily express tender feelings' (see Chapter 4). They may prefer this method of coping as opposed to anger (a common male coping mechanism), or to the 'brave', 'silent' and inexpressive way of suffering, necessary to ensure a man retains his manliness (Farrell, 1974, p.71).

The men were divided on this point, half agreeing with the idea and half disagreeing (sex difference significant at 0.001 level). As it has been regarded traditionally as 'sissy' and unmanly to show emotion in 'feminine' ways (Bell, 1974; Farrell,

1974), this result does suggest a possible change away from the traditional stereotype for some men. A change in this direction might eliminate the 'emotional constipation' from which Farrell says many men suffer. It may also encourage freer interchange of emotion between women and men. It would, for example, make available to men the type of sympathetic and comforting reinforcement which issues from an emotional/tearful response to stress, but which may not accompany a withdrawing or angry response.

The responses to this question may indicate a willingness, not just for men to cry and show emotion, but to create, as Farrell (1974) suggests, "a change in the environment which will encourage men to cry when they feel the need" (p.72).

Another related question involved role change for men too. The responses of both men and women were evenly distributed over the suggestion that men should be able to lean on their wives or girlfriends for financial and emotional security (Q21) (no significant sex difference). A problem with this question may have been the use of both 'financial' and 'emotional', which could have caused some confusion. It would have been more useful if the two kinds of support had appeared separately.

Nevertheless, the question entailed a liberal suggestion and the results were less conservative than expected. In fact, half the sample <u>did</u> feel that men should be able to have this kind of support (women = 49.4% and men = 49.3%). For this section of the sample, a more dependent behaviour option

was seen as acceptable for men, while a stronger and independent 'supporter' role option should be available to women.

The responses to these two questions indicate some support for a movement toward less restrictive and traditional roles for men.

Sexual freedom (questions 8 and 11). Women strongly disagreed that loose sexual behaviour is acceptable and understandable in a man (Q8). There was a significant difference in response between the sexes on this item, as men's responses were evenly distributed between the two poles. This disagreement from women and 59.1 percent of the men, however, may only indicate a moral response to loose sexual behaviour in general.

Both women and men agreed that women should have full control of their bodies and give or withhold sexual intimacy as they choose (Q11). This response indicates a recognition of the right of the individual woman to control her own sexuality, but again the percentage of people who disagreed (men = 37.9%, women = 27.6%) may be responding to related issues, for example, extramarital sex.

These two questions were too limited to supply anything but surface attitudes to what is a large and complex area of attitude research. They were not effective questions and did not adequately gauge attitudes to male/female sexual freedom.

Work roles (questions 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 13 and 25). Results for the questions on work roles were at times contradictory. Most questions were concerned with the married women's working role.

Both men and women agreed that marriage should make as little difference to a woman's career as it does to a man's (though the significance level for male responses was lower, $p=0.01$) (Q25). They thus felt that there should be equality with respect to the disruption of career opportunities upon marriage. But the question does imply that it means "upon marrying" and may therefore suggest that there are no children involved. Questions on marriage with children may have elicited different responses.

On the question of whether working wives should leave their jobs if their husbands want them to (Q4), women failed to significantly agree or disagree. Men, however, agreed that they should leave (the sex difference was significant).

A significant number of women disagreed with the suggestion that men should not encourage their wives to work if they wanted to, but men failed to significantly support either pole (Q12). Again, the sex difference was significant.

Women failed to agree or disagree on the question that "married women should only work when more money is needed to improve the family's standard of living" (Q13). Men agreed that this should be the only reason for married women to work. This appears to be a traditionally-oriented finding in that women still need financial necessity as an excuse to work. But

the fact that 54.1 percent of women and nearly one third (31.1%) of men disagreed with the stipulation, may indicate an attitude in the process of change. It is certainly a more liberal finding than that of the Chombart de Lauwe (1962) study. In this French survey, sixty lower-income couples and sixty middle-income couples with children were interviewed. Just under a third of middle-income women and a quarter of lower-income women thought that paid work is good "for the woman herself". Fewer men responded this way.

It is possible, though, that this attitude is associated with a common general attitude which Encel et al. (1974) discuss: "that the motive for working is essentially pecuniary" (p.70). This attitude would also be applied to men.

In apparent contradiction to this finding, women agreed that regardless of whether they had children or not, women should work outside the home if that is what they want to do (Q2). Men's responses were more evenly distributed, favouring neither pole. However, 59.1 percent agreed that children should not have a bearing on whether women work, and this is socially, if not statistically, significant.

In the Chombart de Lauwe (1962) study both men and women disapproved of work for mothers with young children and more women than men agreed with working mothers of school-age children, though the percentages generally were low (no more than 30% of women agreed). Gibbons, Ponting, and Symons (1978), in a Canadian survey of attitudes, also found that two-thirds

of their respondents "strongly agreed that, when children are young, a mother's place is in the home" (p.24).

The present study's figures are considerably more liberal than both the French figures and the more liberal Canadian attitudes. The male responses in particular, appear to be considerably more liberal than would be expected from most previous studies (for example, Tomeh, 1978).

Both men and women agreed that a woman should not consider her own needs more than her family's when taking a job (Q3). This finding seems to contradict the previous result for women, that children should not interfere with the woman's desire to work. It may, however, indicate that people feel women should be free to work if they have children as long as the family's needs are met first and the woman ensures that measures are adequate to meet those needs. Tomeh (1978) found in her study that husbands were very concerned that the welfare of the family and children be catered for. She found, for example, that if the job of the wife requires her to be away while the husband takes charge of the children, men and women do not favour the wife's occupational interests. She notes that "the presence of children continues to pose a barrier to the employment of mothers" (p.345).

Previously, Mason et al. (1976) had noted that between 1970 and 1973 there were "sizeable increases" in the percentage of women supporting the rights of women to keep their jobs while bearing children. But the situation in the

present study seems similar to Penman's (1975) findings. From the responses of her Melbourne female respondents she found a desire to seek more role alternatives in their lives, but they were limited by the desire to "satisfy traditional family needs first".

The present result does indicate that the belief that a woman's needs and desires should always be the last to be fulfilled still has some support. It would have been interesting to have asked the same question about men working. It may be that this question is related to the perceived responsibilities of family life. If asked with respect to men it is possible that the result would be similar, since the man in his role of breadwinner would also be expected to see to his family's needs first.

With respect to the male role, women were divided on the issue of whether married men should be able to stay at home and rear children while their wives support them (Q10). Men disagreed with the idea. This disagreement indicates that the male role with respect to child-rearing is still strongly defined as the traditional one by men. This proposal was, though, quite radical considering present role patterns in the family and did, in fact, suggest a complete role reversal. There was, therefore, an indication of attitude change in that 43.5 percent of women and 26.8 percent of men agree with this role - reversal suggestion. The finding is similar to that of Tomeh (1978) who found clear evidence that women "are significantly more likely than men to indicate a preference

for a non-traditional family structure" (p.344).

But the results for women did not yield significant support for the role-reversed option and may reflect one of Penman's (1975) findings. In her Australian study she found that, although women showed a willingness to move "towards a more flexible liberal role position in society", they were not willing to change roles in the family.

It is noteworthy that, although attitudes towards women in a work role seem to be liberalising, the male role in general is still work-oriented. Pleck and Sawyer (1974) comment that this role is well-established because of the association between work and masculinity. They write that "masculinity is also measured by the prestige and power a position bestows ... we men work as hard as we do because we have learned that is what we are supposed to do" (p.95). The breadwinner role is so strongly associated with men's identity that the alternative of child-rearing would be, for many men, an unmanning experience. But, in fact, reduced emphasis on the 'man equals worker' identity may be less stressful for men. Farrell (1974) argues this point well, and stresses that if there were less emphasis placed on the prestige of work, there would also be less contempt for women who do not work in an occupation. He writes:

> The breadwinner role creates one of the strongest pressures on men. By linking the male role to breadwinning we are indirectly saying, "The higher your achievement in that role the more masculine you are". Like most pressures on men to achieve this pressure also creates a simultaneous disrespect for women who do not achieve (p.50).

In general women were liberal or divided in their responses to work role questions, while men were more conservative (see Table 28). The indications are that about half the women consider a 'work-role' as a suitable role for married women and accept the reason for working as more than financial necessity.

The Chombart de Lauwe (1962) study also found that, in general, women were consistently more approving than men of women being employed. But Fransella and Frost (1977) point out that this 'approval' may be a different thing to women's preference. In the French study, when asked whether they would prefer to work, about three-quarters of the lower-income women preferred not to work, and this result was unaffected by whether they did work or not. More of the middle-income group preferred work though, and only a quarter of these working women would have liked to give it up. These women, of course, probably had a greater choice of jobs which were more interesting and would have better facilities to cope with the dual role involved (Fransella & Frost, 1977). More than half of the middle-income group who were not working preferred not to work.

In the present female sample there seems to be an accepted move towards the image of women as work-oriented and many women consider the man as homemaker and child-rearer to be a viable alternative.

The general conservatism of the men indicates that the role of breadwinner is still strongly identified by them as the male role. This is reinforced by both men and women

agreeing that men should be largely concerned with earning a good living (Q28). This attitude was also found by Tomeh (1978); although their responses were not extremely traditional, men were not as eager as women to see wives or mothers depart from a traditional orientation. Men in her study, tended to stress the nuclear family structure based on role specialization along traditional lines. This point was also discussed by Encel et al. (1974) who comment that the prestige and status of a man largely depends on his ability to support his wife and family.

Results in the present study also indicate that men reserve the right to dispense the 'right to work' to their wives. But it should be noted that, although the results for men were traditionally oriented, interesting indications of support for change were often seen in the strength of responses for the liberal alternatives. Thus, although the figures were not significant, 48 percent disagreed that a husband should not encourage his wife to work. As well as this 31 percent felt that women should not work for money only, reinforcing the idea of women working if they desire, for the satisfaction working itself might bring them. These figures show some similarity to those of Bryson and Thompson (1972) who studied 344 Melbourne households. Husbands were divided on the issue of their wives working : 21 percent disapproved, 36 percent approved conditionally (usually because of financial reasons) and 43 percent approved unconditionally.

So overall the picture of work as a male domain was still prevalent but women held more liberal attitudes than

men. The results seemed at times to be contradictory as were some of the results in the Holter (1970) study of Oslo employees. In that study, for example, three-quarters of the respondents agreed with the principle of equal opportunities at work, yet half indicated that women should stay at home rather than work. Fransella and Frost (1977) commented that "when beliefs and customs are changing, people can hold conflicting views at the same time, although a person's tolerance of this is, of course, limited" (p.31). Results from the present study would support this point and they give enough evidence to conclude: firstly, that people are still uncertain about the work role of women, but secondly, that there are hesitant indications of change, as has been found elsewhere (Mason et al., 1976).

Job equality and equality of opportunity (questions 7, 15, 19, 27, 30, 32 and 33). On the issue of educational opportunities, women disagreed that sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters (Q30). The men did not significantly agree or disagree and the responses were strongest in the agree mildly (27.5%) and disagree strongly (38.6%) categories. Although the male response suggests that to some men higher education is not as necessary for a girl as for a boy, the disagreement of the women and of half the male sample indicates general support for equality of educational opportunity. A problem with the question, however, may lie in the wording, which was American-oriented (from the AWS). A substitution of "higher education" for "college" may have been a clearer wording.

Support was strong for the suggestion that single women should develop a career which interests them rather than just waiting to get married (Q15). Both women and men strongly agreed with this viewpoint (90.2% and 98.7% respectively). A career was thus seen as important for the single girl.

On a question taken from the AWS, women disagreed that it is ridiculous for a woman to drive a locomotive and a man to darn socks (Q19). Men's responses were evenly distributed. But both men and women agree that women should have equal opportunities with men for apprenticeship in the trades (Q27). Women would be welcome in such occupations as plumber, electrician and panel beater. This question is probably more useful as an indication of a general liberal attitude to women entering traditionally male occupations. Question 19 related more to the role-reversal question (Q10), where men were more conservative than women with respect to an exchange of familial or work roles.

Women also agreed that men should be able to enter traditionally female occupations such as secretarial work, nursing and midwifery (Q32), but men's responses were evenly distributed on this question. It is interesting that men were more reticent about allowing men into 'female' occupations than they were about allowing women into 'male' occupations. It may indicate that they are more familiar with and ready to accept the latter but fear a de-masculinisation of men from the former. However, 46.7 percent of men did agree with the suggestion, which indicates some support for it.

Women and men agreed that there should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex (Q33); and women disagreed that men should get preference for jobs even if the women who apply have the same qualifications (Q7). For men, the responses on question 7 were divided between agreement and disagreement. This implies that the men felt uncertainty about appointments to jobs on an equal basis but supported equality in promotion practices. This response may have been influenced by the difficult unemployment problems which were current in Australia at the time of interviewing. Unemployment was very high and at such times, traditional ideas about a "man's right to work" and accompanying theories about maternal deprivation re-emerge (Farrell, 1974, p.122).

These findings are similar to those of Tomeh (1978) who found that "the one instance in which men and women did not differ significantly" was in the belief that working women and working men should get ahead in the same way (p.344). Mason et al. (1976) also found increases in the percentages of people endorsing the rights of women to be considered for top jobs on equal footing with men.

In general, the findings for this group of questions were indicative of liberal responses by women and liberal or non-discriminating responses by men (see Table 28). The lack of conservatism may suggest that the increasing number of women in the workforce is producing attitude change.

Economic roles (questions 17, 23 and 28). As indicated previously, both men and women agreed that men should be concerned largely with earning a good living (Q28). This is consistent with the attitude that the male role is that of breadwinner (Farrell, 1974) and there was no sex difference in the responses.

A question taken from the AWS yielded a liberal attitude from both men and women. Both agreed that women earning as much as their dates should share equally the expenses when they go out together (Q23).

Women disagreed that they should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than men (Q17). Men were evenly distributed so that half felt women capable of this economic contribution and half did not. There may, however, have been a problem with respect to the term 'less capable' as it may be interpreted as, "women have less potential for contributing to economic production", or "women are at this moment less capable of contributing to economic production". The first would not be true (see Dahlstrom, 1971; Kreps, 1971; Mydral and Klein, 1968); but the second may seem to be true, in that if many women are tied to their homes without job training, they may be less capable of contributing directly to economic production than men (as, for example, measured by Gross National Product; Kreps, 1971).

This is of course an argument of some magnitude in the literature. The discussion of the economic contribution of the home-maker includes a consideration of whether housework

should be salaried, and if so, who should pay (Kreps, 1971; Vanck, 1974). However, detailed questions on this topic could not be included as the size of the questionnaire would have been considerably increased.

Political Roles (questions 1, 20 and 29). The three items associated with political roles yielded sex differences (see Table 28). Responses from men indicated a lack of consensus about where women stand with respect to political and social power, while the attitudes of women were liberal.

Both men and women agreed that Australian women should take more responsibility than they have done in trying to influence decisions of political and social importance (Q1). Women disagreed that men should be more interested in political affairs than women (Q20). But men's responses were divided on this issue. This indicates a contradictory response from some men, who felt that women should take more responsibility for influencing political decisions, yet men should be more interested in political affairs.

These results suggest a possible difference in the political roles ascribed to the sexes, where men are seen as more active than women. In discussing the United Nations study edited by Maurice Duverger (1955), Encel et al. (1974) noted a relevant point. Though the granting of the vote to women implied a change in the attitudes of men, it was only a small change and in fact "men continued to believe that political *activity* (my italics) was a masculine prerogative" (p.246), and that women's political activity becomes stabilised at a low level.

Finally, women disagreed that the intellectual leadership of society should be largely in the hands of men, but men again failed to significantly agree or disagree (Q29).

Thus in general women indicated that they wanted more responsibility for political and social decisions, felt they should be more interested in political affairs, and did not feel the intellectual leadership of the community should be in the hands of men. Men showed a certain ambivalence in their responses, feeling women should be more responsible for political and social decisions, but failing to agree with questions which indicate active leadership and power for women. This type of attitude has been commented on by Wishart (1975) who notes that the public, as opposed to the domestic sphere, has been traditionally a male domain and that the prevailing sex-role ideology effectively precludes "most women from taking an effective or extensive part in public political activity" (p.369). Wishart (1975) extends this point, writing that women are ineffective in the world of politics because of the isolated existence of the majority of women, their limited scope, lower status and domesticity. Politics to the general public "centres on and expresses both the masculine stereotype and the belief in the public realm as man's realm" (p.370). These comments are similar to those of Encel et al. (1974), who write that to succeed in politics, women have to conform to male models.

6.3 Summary comments on the ASRQ results.

In general, the responses on the ASRQ were liberal and indicated a change away from the traditional attitudes which were outlined in the literature on Australian sex-roles (e.g. Encel et al., 1974; Dixon, 1976; Mercer, 1975; Stephenson, 1970). This was particularly so for women, as Tables 28 and 29 show. There seemed to be a general liberal orientation for both sexes toward household duties, divorce and job equality (though less so for men in the latter section). Work roles, however, seemed to be strongly defined in the traditional way by men. There were some indications that attitudes to women and work are becoming more liberal even though restraints are still placed on their working.

As Table 29 shows, women gave more 'liberal' responses than did men, and the male responses were often split between agreement and disagreement. Most conservative responses were from men on the female-specific items but, in general, 'conservative' responses were few. Thus, although men were more conservative than women, relatively speaking they were generally not 'conservative'.

These findings are similar to those of other studies (Tomeh, 1978). Mason et al. (1976) found considerable change in sex role attitudes from 1964 to 1974, though they dealt only with a female sample. Their findings in summary are similar to those of the present study:

> While the traditional sex division of labour within the family continues to receive more support than do inequalities in the labour market rights of the sexes, attitudes about family roles have changed as much over

the past decade as have those about work roles (p.593).

6.3.1 The implications of changes in sex roles.

Mason et al. (1976) indicate that change in attitudes towards women's roles would be a necessary effect of increased education for women, the influence of the women's movement, and the increasing number of women entering the workforce. This would, they argue, lead women to see non-marriage and work as less deviant roles for women.

In general, this seems to be the case. To women, a work role is becoming an acceptable one. But this is not acceptable if it means a lack of fulfilment of the traditional responsibilities of family and husband (Tomeh, 1978). If this is the case, there may be increased stress and conflict for women as they attempt to combine all roles available to them, particularly if their husband's role is not flexible enough to allow him to share the household duties.[18] Tomeh (1978) found that women preferred a family structure based on sex-role sharing while men tended to want to preserve their own interests and authority as traditionally defined. She comments that this incompatability of expectations may either cause conflict for women or force them "to make adaptations in order to accommodate their own interests and those of the family" (p.352). The alternatives open to women in this situation Tomeh sees as: separation or divorce, having no children or few children,

---

[18] Emphasis tends to be on the married women here because the ASRQ questions dealt primarily with them. Furthermore, issues of the homemaker versus worker role apply to them rather than to single women.

taking jobs which complement family activities, and non-marriage. The increased desire for work and alternative roles to that of child-rearing will lead to changing familial, as well as work roles, for women, but there will be a possible cost in stress and conflict. This is particularly true for women in the transitional period (moving from traditional to non-traditional attitudes and behaviours).

Cohen and Burdsal (1978) discuss a study by Hall and Gordon (1973) which found that part-time working women experienced greater conflict and pressure than full-time employed women or full-time housewives. Glenn and Walters (1966) comment that it is not which option the woman chooses which is important but how she feels about the choice and how her husband, family and friends react to her choice. It appears that greater role freedom implies choice and it is the availability of choice which leads to stress. This kind of stress was not inherent in the traditional role structure.

For men too, the change in women's roles may initiate stress and conflict. Tresemer and Pleck (1974) discussed the two traditional domains, instrumental and expressive, with respect to changing roles. They note that men are responding firstly, to women becoming more instrumental and task-oriented, which challenges traditional male roles; and secondly, to women becoming less willing to "exclusively serve male emotional needs at the expense of other goals and ambitions" (Tresemer & Pleck, 1974, p.72). The first role-sphere relates to increasing numbers of working women, and the related attitudes have already

been outlined in this section. Generally, male attitudes were conservative. This response could be interpreted as a fear that work will lose its status as an all-male domain, and this has important ramifications for the male identity. It has already been stated that work and the masculine identity are closely related (Farrell, 1974; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974). In fact the pressure on men to work often causes stress, and Jourard (1971) notes that the image of a worthwhile man as a working man takes its toll on men in retirement. After assuming their 'life of leisure' they gradually deteriorate. Gould (1973) also discusses masculinity and the 'size of the pay check'. He comments that after great losses of money which represented loss of self and of masculine image, men often suicide.

These writers would agree that less emphasis on the importance of work for men as the only source of 'self' would be a healthy move and would remove a great deal of the stress involved in the breadwinner role.

Encel et al. (1974) foresee a change in attitudes to women in the work sphere to be a logical consequence of more women actually entering the workforce. They write:

> And where men are accustomed to women working, and to the broader interrelation of the sexes that follows from this, they are more likely to be tolerant of women seeking roles beyond those that are traditionally accepted (p.69).

The second point made by Tresemer and Pleck (1974) relates to the refusal of women to serve male emotional needs, which would frustrate "traditional male emotional dependence

on women" (p.72). The authors note that, although it has been pointed out that women often live vicariously through their husbands' achievements, the fact that husbands often simultaneously live through their wives' emotionality has been neglected. Little has been written on men's dependence on women for the satisfaction of their emotional needs. They write that "because of traditional male emotional constriction, many men feel that without women they are unable to experience themselves emotionally" (p.72).

Farrell (1974) also discusses men's "emotional constipation" and Balswick and Peek (1971) call the inexpressive male the "tragedy of American society". Jourard (1971) also writes that men typically reveal less information about themselves to others than do women. This 'impersonal' aspect of manliness is an added burden for men. But where, in the past, women have fulfilled the role of interpreters of men's expressive nature, the change in role orientation means that they may become less willing to do so. The traditional interdependence or complementarity of instrumental/expressive roles is now being questioned and men will need to learn to be expressive. The results of the present study indicate a movement towards this as women disagreed that men should not be able to cry and emotionally express themselves as women do. Furthermore half the men also disagreed, indicating that they realised that the expressive role can and should be open to them. On the two questions relating to emotional support for men there was no conservative response from either sex, indicating a possible attitude change.

Discussing the need for more research on male-role attitudes, Parelius (1975) comments that marital strain and instability between the sexes will result if male attitudes remain rigidly traditional, and if they lag substantially behind female attitudes. But, she says, "if male attitudes are changing in the same direction and as rapidly as those of females, new patterns of family life will surely emerge" (p.152). It is difficult to determine the pace of the change in male attitudes or, indeed, if there has been a change, because there is a dearth of information on men, their roles and their attitudes.

In the present study the responses of the male sample were often evenly divided between agreement and disagreement on issues. If, as the literature indicates, they should have been more conservative, then perhaps this result could be accepted as indicating changing attitudes. And if there is attitude change for men as well as for women, the transition from a traditional to non-traditional role structure may involve less stress and conflict than at present is envisaged. Although attitudes and behaviour are not necessarily correlated, a liberal attitude could make a transition period in behaviour less stressful.

Many writers present a positive view of the future of sex role changes, from a female and male perspective. Tresemer and Pleck (1974) write:

> we believe that men have the inner resources to adapt to the changing status of women in a humanly creative way, and to find in the realignment of the sexes new freedom and new liberation for themselves (p.77).

With respect to the changing identity of men and its relation to work, Pleck and Sawyer suggest re-defining work and work-associated desires. They write that men "can find ways to work with involvement, with cooperation, and in emotional contact with self and others" (p.95).

Work roles for women would increase their economic independence and the employment role played by women would have a "reciprocal relationship with their roles within the family, the education system and family life" (Encel et al., 1974, p.69). Encel et al. (1974) comment that working women become more interested in community activities, display greater political independence and are more active in their roles. Optimistically, they comment that "it not merely conditions their own attitudes; it conditions the attitude of men" (p.69).

In their analysis of the situation, Mason et al. (1976) concluded that in the future, trends in women's education and workforce participation may be more important for predicting attitude change than trends within the family sphere. Encel et al. (1974) would agree that this was partly true but they comment that until the dual role of women is eliminated, true equality of sex roles will not be possible. Men, as well as women, need to recognise that they have multiple responsibilities within the work sphere, the family, the child-rearing area, and with each other in their relationship. These authors write:

> Perhaps the most fundamental inequality is that which permits men to avoid this duality and to fasten it upon women, thus generating a structure of power and

> privilege which has so far remained independent of other social changes (p.303).

For writers such as Farrell (1974), however, true attitude change comes about in the consciousness-raising group and he believes that after attitude change, behavioural change will follow.

As has been mentioned, the measurement of change of attitude is difficult, particularly in the Australian setting where there are few empirical data with which to compare the results of the present study. Responses in this study generally were removed from traditional attitudes and were moderately liberal. Hopefully, both attitudes and behaviour will change toward a liberal perspective. Encel et al. (1974) comment that: "the position of women in Australian society is clearly in process of transformation" and it seems that people have favourable attitudes to changes in some aspects of the male role.

Both Encel et al. (1974) and Connell (1974) are optimistic about a movement within sex-role divisions toward equality. Connell concludes: "what is constantly in process is capable of change" (p.285), and this change will hopefully be related to the restrictive aspects of men's roles as well as women's.

Chapter 7 Conclusions and a consideration of present and future sex role research.

The results presented in chapters four, five and six, give an interesting insight into Australian attitudes to sex roles and stereotypic traits. Some traditionally oriented beliefs continue to prevail but some attitudes appear to have changed, making Australian sex role attitudes appear as less rigid than the literature portrays (e.g., Encel, MacKenzie, & Tebbutt, 1974). The Semantic Differential results, in association with the data from the BSRI, indicate that Self and Ideal descriptions involving traditional masculine and feminine characteristics are more masculine-oriented than has been the case in the past. As has been argued, this can indicate significant change in sex-role trait perception. The 'competency' and 'expressive' clusters of traits are now perceived as desirable for both women and men, and the mature adult is seen as an active, independent but expressive person.

With respect to role orientation, people still adhere to some traditional beliefs, but many responses on the ASRQ indicated a less conservative or traditional attitude than has been claimed in the past (Encel et al., 1974). It is possible that these attitude changes may lead to role changes. As the discussion in section 6.3.1 (ASRQ) indicates, these role changes can be expected due to various societal influences, such as the Women's Movement, the greater number of women entering the workforce and the necessity for role changes because of the increase in dual career or single person social units. There is in this study some encouraging evidence that people's perceptions of the desirability of

certain traits and roles are changing and that society is moving toward the 'hybrid' situation envisaged by Rossi (1969).

One of the indications of this change was the great overlap of characteristics and behaviour attributed to men and women in this study. Often the similarities outnumbered the differences. The danger in searching artificially for sex differences is obvious in supporting the status quo of sex role divisions. If there are greater similarities between men and women than there are differences, these should be stressed. Rogers (1975) raises this point when she writes:

> Why do we always look for sex differences and race into publication when we find them? Why are we not more ecstatic about similarities between the sexes? Is it simply this terrible need for mankind to see things in terms of dichotomies, or is there more to it? Might it not be derived from the fact that a large amount of our social activity is organised around sex differences rather than similarities (p.36).

A number of authors have raised this issue (Bernard, 1975; Lipman-Blumen & Tickamyer, 1975) but because of the large amount of work in the sex difference area (one of the four major areas of sex role research outlined by Hochschild, 1973), similarities still tend to be overlooked. Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) feel this problem to be particularly acute in this area of research "where the pursuit of differences may obscure the actual ratio of differences to similarities" (p.302).

One of the disturbing questions raised by the present study was that of the adequacy of the assessment methods used in sex role research. Various methodological problems associated with the scales used in this study have been dealt with in chapters four, five and six. But the data, especially the ASRQ

data, suggest the possibility that the reality of sex role perceptions and interactions may be more complex than is recognised by assessment procedures. People appear as more flexible than they have been given credit for by researchers, and the question arises - are we assessing and measuring sex roles and change adequately?

There are initially a number of conceptual problems to be clarified: does the area of sex role research include sex roles, sex traits and sex preferences; can changes in sex role attitudes be assessed; and are attitudes and behaviour being clearly delineated?

The first point has been dealt with in chapter one in some detail. Essentially, 'sex role research' usually deals with the cultural roles traditionally ascribed differentially to the two sexes, as well as the trait descriptions associated with the 'masculine' and 'feminine' personalities.

The second point is more difficult because 'change' is in itself difficult to measure. It is possible that replication studies can be conducted over a period of years but at present this is not happening. In the large number of studies in this area researchers continually change their methodology, the scales used, or the statistical procedure, so that little replication is taking place (Worrell, 1978). Furthermore, the extensive testing of college samples means that general population attitudes are not being tapped and changes in society cannot be assessed.

Millman (1971) in her critique of a number of studies comments that often researchers claim there is no evidence of change when they have studied samples taken from areas of society where change is least likely to occur, for example, in the family. One study has shown a change in corporation managers' behaviour. In the past the traditionally masculine leadership-dominance characteristics were required in this position, but characteristically feminine interpersonal abilities are now desirable. Millman comments that when the study of sex roles includes a functional perspective it "might suggest that changes in sex roles in American society may actually be happening quite rapidly and broadly" (p.776).

Thirdly, the attitude-behaviour dilemma is as problematic in this area of research as in other areas of social psychology. The arguments about the existence of attitudes and attitude-behaviour consistency have been discussed in general elsewhere (Deutscher, 1973; Fazio & Zanna, 1978; Kelman, 1974).

In his interesting discussion Kelman (1974) argues that attitudes are not an index of action, "but a determinant, component and consequence of it" (p.316). Some of his comments about attitudes illuminate reasons for the difficulty of assessing sex role attitudes: they develop and change as people are exposed to new experiences and information; they change very slowly, mainly because the attitudes a person has influences the experiences they encounter; and they affect

the way in which a person organizes, accepts or rejects information. Thus, by its very functioning, an attitude creates conditions for its own confirmation rather than disconfirmation.

When these characteristics are applied to sex role attitudes it is clear why change is difficult to institute and why it is difficult to measure. Most of the research has concentrated on attitudes to, or perceptions of, sex roles and traits. It could be assumed that sex role researchers accept the link between attitudes and behaviour to be a valid one. This is exemplified in the work of Bem (1974) who uses an adjective description scale to assess androgyny and then discusses androgynous people as behaving in flexible ways. Bem has also attempted to find behavioural support for this conceptualization (1975, 1976) and is one of the few researchers to do so. It seems that this behavioural area of sex role research needs to be extended in association with questionnaire studies.

It is noteworthy that little has appeared in the literature about the problems with sex role research methodology. As a young area of research it is still coming to grips with the understanding that a major paradigm has changed. The acceptance of the rigid allocation of sex-appropriate roles and the assumption that 'females equal femininity' and 'males equal masculinity' have crumbled under the wave of criticism inspired by the new perception of these issues in the early sixties. But possibly the most productive period of work was initiated by Bem and her development of 'androgyny'. The

present study was undertaken early in this period and the use of bi-polar items on a Semantic Differential in association with the BSRI is evidence of this. The enthusiasm generated by 'androgyny' has led to a great deal of research. But there are some indications that a period of critical assessment of this research and its methodology (particularly the scoring of the BSRI) is beginning (Spence, Helmreich, & Stapp, 1975; Worrell, 1978). These criticisms of the BSRI indicate a move towards critical assessment of recent sex role research after the period of initial enthusiasm.

The most productive and critical overview to emerge is Worrell's (1978) paper on methodology. Although it deals primarily with the androgyny and adjustment research, the paper can be applied to sex role research in general.[19] Of a number of critical issues which Worrell raises, one worth noting is that frequently a study is conducted with no consideration of its relationship to a general sex role theory. Thus a basic research premise is ignored: that research is aimed at testing theory.

Secondly, the samples tested in most studies are limited to college populations. They are usually also young, white

---

[19]Vaughter (1976) comments that the study of motivational processes and the study of fear of success are synonymous in the Psychology of Women. It seems that the study of androgyny and of sex roles may have a similar relationship at present. It should be pointed out too that the majority of sex role research is North American, so criticisms of the research generally refer to this body of data.

and middle-class. This is particularly relevant to sex role research where differences can be expected between different age groups and populations.[20] Worrell also notes that in many cases samples are not adequately defined.

Scoring and statistical procedures also generate problems. Because of the controversy over both of these, each new study appears to use a different method of analysis, often not clearly explained. With respect to the psychometric definition of androgyny, Worrell writes:

> At the present time, considerable disagreement exists concerning the appropriate method for translating raw scores on current sex-role scales into a predictive metric that is both statistically sound and psychologically meaningful (p.788).

Worrell mentions a number of other points, including the problems of validity in designing behavioural tasks. But the main problem caused by methodological faults in the research is that studies are difficult to replicate. Thus although much research has been generated, there is not a strong body of replicated findings related, for example, to the theory of androgyny.

Worrell too feels that the complexity of sex role related attitudes and behaviour may not be tapped by present methods. She too questions whether the scale assessments will predict behaviour and notes that role-determined behaviours may not

---

[20] In the present study differences in responses on items of the ASRQ were investigated for the different groups according to age, marital status, education, socio-economic class and nationality of self, mother and father. Differences were found on only a few questions and these differed across each variable. Some variables showed no differences.

co-exist with trait descriptions. She concludes:

> A final issue concerns the extent to which the characteristics measured by any of these current sex-role scales reflect unitary traits or wide dispositions that are predictive of a wide range of behaviours, attitudes, and life-style choices (p.789).

Related to this comment is the rigid and fixed nature of the instruments used, which was discussed with respect to the BSRI and the Semantic Differential (chapters 4 and 5).

The problems in sex role research are becoming clearly delineated as researchers begin to assess the usefulness of this growing body of work. But, as Worrell suggests, the problems she discussed are surmountable. At this point it is worthwhile summarizing what Bernard (1975) refers to as the "state of the art" with respect to present and future sex role research.

In recent decades some of the major paradigms in sex role research have been attacked (Pleck, 1975). Science is not value free. It exhibits bias in the subjects it chooses to study or not to study, the methodology which it engages, and the interpretation placed on the results. The scientists who conduct research are products of their culture as well as being influenced by current scientific paradigms. Furthermore, the allocation of research grants, and the selection process for journal publications (e.g., rejection of negative findings) further guide the course of scientific research. Frieze et al. (1978) outline in detail the types of bias evident in research associated with the psychology of women. Science and society thus interact, often

reinforcing inappropriate or misleading 'scientific' findings (Bryson, 1979, Winkler, 1973).

Realising these issues, psychologists began to be aware of the biases in psychological research. The sudden emergence of a strong Woman's Movement in the 1960's created a further influence which penetrated into the study of sex roles and sex differences in psychology. In this period too (late 1960's) the movement toward social responsibility in science emerged in strength (Johnstone, 1979), encouraging an awareness of the society-science interaction and the necessity for researchers to consider the social ramifications of their work.

Following the pattern of Kuhn's (1970) theory of scientific revolutions, sex role research began to present anomalies in the standard paradigms, which were, for example, that men should be masculine and women feminine, and that sex role divisions and behaviours were based on 'natural' differences, anatomy being destiny. During the last decade sex role research has been in a period of "crisis" and from this period new theories are emerging.

Interesting alternative theories, for example, have been proposed in the area of the development of sex roles. Pleck (1975) proposed a model based on Kohlberg's (1968) theory of moral development. It involved three phases: the first, when a child has a disorganised view of sex roles; the second, when the child learns the traditional 'rules' of sex role behaviour; and the third, a transcendent stage, when the

individual achieves the 'androgynous' personality.

This model is similar to Rebecca, Hefner, and Oleshansky's (1976) model of sex role transcendence. Their model had three similar stages: an undifferentiated conception of sex roles; a polarised conception; and a transcendent stage. The differences between the two models lies in Stage III of the process. Rebecca et al. (1976) differentiate their third stage from the 'androgyny' theory with its emphasis on traits. They see the transcendent stage as dynamic, where the person is flexible in differing situations, but they also include personally relevant variables, such as personal integrity. For example, an individual may be able to express aggression but may not agree with overtly aggressive behaviour.

Both of these theories share a major difference with the previous sex role paradigm. In the past 'sex role' was something the individual achieved when he or she reached a stage of 'sex-appropriate' behaviour, but the new theories allow for change during the life-cycle. They are, therefore, more attuned to recent findings that people become more 'androgynous' as they grow older (Livson, 1975) and also to the increasing interest in developmental life-span psychology (Aiken, 1978; Huyck, 1974; Kalish, 1975; Kennedy, 1978; Troll, 1975).

New paradigms also have come under close scrutiny. The socialization paradigm, that socialization or nurture is the basis of sex differences in personality and behaviour, has been seen by many researchers as an acceptable alternative to

biological determinism. But Bernard (1975) points out that some feminist psychologists now argue that a power, institutional or structural explanation of sex difference is more acceptable; that even if socialization allowed women an equal chance of developing personality and abilities, the power structures would still limit their movement in the same ways.

The changes in language in psychology are further evidence of the search for alternative paradigms. Terms such as 'androgyny', 'transcendence' and 'scripts' (Laws & Schwatz, 1977) form the vocabulary of these paradigms. Hochschild (1973) remarks, for example, that women were previously described as 'field-dependent' and men as 'field-independent'. The male characteristic became the more desirable one. The term has now changed and women are 'field-sensitive' which has more positive connotations. These changes advertise the movement in psychology toward a less male-biased science.

Perhaps one of the dangers of the new movement in psychology is the failure to realise that current paradigms are part of the developing structure of science, and contain within them the pitfalls of previous conceptualizations. For example, the concept of 'androgyny' is limited by being rooted in the previous Masculinity/Femininity conceptualization. Furthermore there is a strong bias towards viewing 'androgyny' as 'good' and 'sex-typing' as 'bad'; and as Worrell (1978) notes, this often presents itself in the literature as a fight between the "white hats" and the "black hats" (p.779).

This view of androgyny and sex-typing may contain a value-judgement which researchers should acknowledge, as the value of 'androgyny' is still uncertain (Jones et al., 1978).

Some of the problems with methodology also ensure that biases still exist in present sex role research, although their orientation may be different. A number of these have already been discussed: the fixed and limited nature of questionnaires, the overuse of college samples, the statistical problems, and the emphasis on differences rather than similarities. But there are a number of other issues which may detract from the usefulness of the findings in some recent studies.

Firstly, there is little research being conducted on men with respect to sex roles. Carlson and Carlson had resported in 1960 that large numbers of male subjects were included in research articles to the exclusion of female subjects. They had surveyed the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1958-1960. In 1976, Peay reported little change since 1960 with an improvement only in the decrease in the over-representation of males in articles using samples of one sex. This increase in studies using all-female samples was obviously a response to the greater interest in the psychology of women.

To redress the imbalance in what was seen as the 'psychology of men', and influenced by the movement for equality, researchers began to study women: their attitudes, their roles, their work versus home orientation. The sex

role position of men with its incumbent problems, and men's relationship to and feelings about their family role, have been largely ignored (Hochschild, 1973; Knox & Kupferer, 1971; Lipman-Blumen & Tickamyer, 1975; Millman, 1971).[21]

This failure to include male subjects or to study the male sex role imperils the understanding of the female role position and of the interrelationships between roles which do exist in society. As Knox and Kupferer (1971) state, "sex-role definitions and conflicts over them are linked in one sociocultural pattern" (p.253). Part of the reason for the neglect of this area of sex role research lies in the basic assumption, which was, and still is, accepted by many women that the male position was good, desirable, without conflict and unproblematic.

Regarding this point, Knox and Kupferer (1971) posed the question:

> If ... the expectations of the sexes towards the rights and duties of women conflict, we may presume that there exists a correlative disagreement over men's rights and duties. Most of the literature fails to entertain this seriously and systematically. If men impose a double set of obligations on women in their roles as wives and mothers may not women do so for their husbands (p.252)?

As the writers on the male sex role indicate, the male role and socialization leads men to experience role strain, conflict, 'emotional constipation' and a limited relationship with women and children (Farrell, 1974; Pleck & Sawyer, 1974).

---

[21]This situation is beginning to change - see three editions of Journals devoted to men: Journal of Social Issues, 1978, 34 (1); The Counselling Psychologist, 1978, 7 (4); Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 1978, 10 (1).

Research into sex roles needs to consider both female and male roles and their interconnected and interdependent relationships. Australian research is particularly scarce and virtually nothing is known about how men themselves see their roles and their relationships with women.

Co-existing with this problem is the tendency to treat women as an homogeneous group. This is possibly related to the concept of 'sisterhood' which came from the Women's Movement, and the attempt to subsume all women irrespective of class, age or occupation under one label. This discussion of 'women' without regard to, for example, age, may be of great significance with respect to roles and attitudes. Differences in sex roles at different ages seems to be a very relevant and necessary area needing investigation at present. There is some indication that people become more androgynous later in life. This suggests that sex role functions may change during the life-span. At present, as Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) note, researchers "often ignore the greater within-group than between-group variance that characterizes the sexes" (p.301).

Clifton, McGrath, and Wick (1976) queried the assumption of a single category of stereotypes of women. They questioned 120 women and 70 men using an adjective check-list procedure. A distinctive stereotype of the 'housewife' role was found which paralleled the traditional female stereotype found in other studies (Broverman et al., 1972; Sherriffs & McKee, 1956). They also found a stereotype of women as "bunny",

emphasizing the 'sex object' view of women. A third stereotype, which was non-traditional, was obtained across the descriptions clubwoman, career woman and woman athlete. These three concepts displayed marked commonalities and shared masculine traits such as 'independent', 'persistent' and 'direct'. The salient point is that the 'stereotype of women' may no longer be a valid concept. Perceptions of women's personalities may be related to their life-role.

Perhaps one of the major problems with sex role research at present is that it tends to be dispersed. There is a lack of recognition of the interplay of variables. Attitudes towards roles are considered without regard for the economic or political climate. For example, the attitudes of people to women and work has been shown to be related to the level of unemployment (Farrell, 1974). Researchers need to consider the social, economic and political purposes sex roles serve and are affected by (Millman, 1971). Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) comment that the varied sources documenting sex differences lead to a number of problems. They write that "research findings involve different disciplines, different methodologies, different questions and assumptions, all applied to different portions of reality" (p.301). It is possible that the most useful solution to the problems in the study of sex roles lies in an inter-disciplinary approach.

If some of the problems discussed can be remedied or controlled for in future research, a more valuable insight

might be gained. Research needs to consider the male role as well as the female role, and to study roles in situations which will indicate change. Because of the interdependence of the personal experience with the social system, more attention needs to be given to the social relationships which create and change attitudes to sex roles.

Millman (1971) and Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer (1975) comment that change needs to be studied. Lipman-Blumen and Tickamyer write that the study of sex roles tends to be in a "taxonomic holding pattern" (p.325) "like most scientific disciplines in their early stages". They stress that research should start to look at processes rather than simply being descriptive. In a similar vein, Millman (1971) writes that it is not enough to consider what sex roles are and how they develop but "why these roles develop and why they are or aren't changing" (p.774). Although their arguments are aimed primarily at sociology, they are also relevant to psychology.

It is probable than an interdisciplinary approach to the study of sex roles would be useful in fulfilling the requirement for the consideration of "processes", and the need to study the social as well as the personal matrix with respect to sex roles. It would also aid in a synthesis of the theoretical basis for analysis which will form the new paradigms, leading to a coherent understanding of sex roles, how they develop and how they change.

This approach would probably be possible in the Australian setting where at present the documented information on sex roles is primarily historical. The problems which have been discussed in this chapter have related to the existing body of sex role research, which is mainly North American. Australian sex role research has been very sparse. In 1975 at the Annual Conference of the Australian Psychological Society a symposium on the Psychology of Women introduced some interesting papers. The November issue that year of the Australian Psychologist was concerned with 'Women and Psychology'. It dealt mainly with the position of women within the profession. In her editorial to that issue, Gault wrote that with respect to the influence of International Women's Year, "the test of changed attitudes is seen in action" (p.292). At that time she wrote that "present feminist critiques call for new theoretical perspectives and for a new methodology" (p.292).

The scene seemed to be set for a development of psychology of women and sex role research within the Australian setting. Little has since appeared in the published material (e.g., Feather, 1978a and b; Penman, 1975; Law, 1976) but a number of symposia at conferences have shown that research is starting to emerge.[22] At this early stage, then, it is instructive to

---

[22]Symposia on sex role research were conducted at the Australian Psychological Society annual meeting, 1977; the New Zealand Psychological Society annual conference, 1978; and the annual congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, 1979.

consider the problems discussed in this chapter.

The research findings in the present study contribute to psychology some knowledge of the Australian community's attitudes to sex roles. It shares some methodological drawbacks with other similar studies. But obvious faults were overcome: the sample was from the general population, sampled in such a way as to be representative; men were included in the sample and male-role questions included in the questionnaires used; and item-response analyses attempted to generate a clearer picture of what people were actually saying rather than using average scores or total score analysis, yielding general rather than specific findings. More detailed research is now needed to extend our knowledge on Australian sex role attitudes, and changes in these attitudes. In a period when the social responsibility of science is being propounded, psychologists should be investigating these attitudes which mould the women and men who form the historical and social matrix unique to Australian society.

References

Aiken, L. Later Life. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders, 1978.

Allport, G.W. Attitudes. In C. Murchinson (Ed.), A Handbook of Social Psychology. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1935.

Anderson, M. and the Feminist Psychology Group. Sex role stereotypes and clinical psychologists: An Australian Study. Australian Psychologist, 1975, 10, 325-332.

Angrist, S. The study of sex roles. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 215-232.

Antill, J. & Cunningham, J. Androgyny, self-esteem and performance on sex-typed ability tasks. In R. Rowland (Chair) Sex roles: Research on Women and Men. Symposium presented at the annual conference of the Australian Psychological Society, Adelaide, August, 1977.

Balswick, J.O. & Peek, C.W. The inexpressive male: A tragedy of American society. The Family Co-ordinator, 1971, Oct., 363-368.

Bardwick, J. The Psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Bardwick, J. & Douvan, E. Ambivalence: The Socialization of women. In J.M. Bardwick (Ed.), Readings on the psychology of women. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Bart, P. Depression in middle-aged women. In S. Cox (Ed.), Female Psychology: The emerging self. Palo Alto: S.R.A., 1976.

Bell, R. The Sex Survey of Australian women. Melbourne: Sun Books, 1974.

Bell, R. Significant roles among a sample of Australian women. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology, 1975, 11, 2-11.

Bem, D.J. Beliefs, attitudes and human affairs. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.

Bem, S.L. The measurement of psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42, 155-162.

Bem, S.L. Sex-role adaptability: One Consequence of psychological androgyny. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 31, 634-643.

Bem, S.L. Probing the promise of androgyny. In A.C. Kaplan & J.P. Bean (Eds.), Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.

Bem, S.L. On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 196-205.

Bem, S.L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. Sex-typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1976, 34, 1016-1023.

Benel, D.C.R. & Benel, R.A. A further note on sex differences on the Semantic Differential. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1976, 15, 437-439.

Bernard, J. Women, wives and mothers: Values and options. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1975.

Berzins, J.I. New perspectives on sex roles and personality dimensions. Paper presented to the 83rd annual meeting of American Psychological Association, Chicago, August, 1975.

Berzins, J.I., Welling, M., & Wetter, R.A. A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the personality research form. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 126-138.

Block, J.H. Conceptions of sex role: Some cross-cultural and longitudinal perspectives. American Psychologist, 1973, 28, 512-526.

Brogan, D. & Kutner, N.G. Measuring sex-role orientation: A normative approach. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1976, 38, 31-40.

Broverman, I.K. Sex-role stereotype questionnaire. Personal communication, 1970.

Broverman, I.K., Vogel, S.R., Broverman, D.M., Clarkson, F.E., & Rosenkrantz, P.S. Sex-role stereotypes: A current appraisal. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 59-78.

Bryson, L. Husband and wife interaction in the Australian family. In J. Mercer (Ed.), The other half: Women in Australian Society. Ringwood, Aust.: Penguin Books, 1975.

Bryson, L. Is scientific value a fiction? Or, how do we proceed now we know science is not value free? Paper presented to 49th Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, January, 1979. Symposia: Social Responsibility and Science.

Bryson, L. & Thompson, F. An Australian Newtown: Life and leadership in a working class suburb. Melbourne, Aust.: Penguin, 1972.

Carlson, E.R. & Carlson, R. Male and female subjects in personality research. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1960, 61, 482-483.

Chafetz, J.S. Masculine/Feminine or Human? Itasca, Illinois: Peacock, 1974. Second edition, 1978.

Chombart de Lauwe, P. The Status of women in French urban society. International Social Science Journal, 1962, 14, 26-65. Cited in F. Fransella & K. Frost, Women: On being a woman. London: Tavistock, 1977.

Clifton, A.K., McGrath, D. & Wick, B. Stereotypes of women: A single category? Sex Roles, 1976, 2, 135-148.

Cohen, P.M. & Burdsal, C.A. Factor analytic examination of role attitudes of married women. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 423-434.

Congalton, A.A. Status and Prestige in Australia. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1969.

Connell, R.W. You can't tell them apart nowadays can you? Search, 1974, 5, 282-285.

Consentino, F. & Heilbrun, A.B. Anxiety correlates of sex-role identity in college students. Psychological Reports, 1964, 14, 729-730.

Constantinople, A. Masculinity-femininity: An exception to the famous dictum? Psychological Bulletin, 1973, 80, 389-407.

Cowan, M.L. & Stewart, B.J. A methodological study of sex stereotypes. Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 205-216.

Dahlstrom, E. (Ed.) The changing roles of men and women. Boston: Beacon Press, 1971.

Deaux, K. The behaviour of women and men. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1976.

Der-Karabetian, A. & Smith, A.J. Sex-role stereotyping in the United States: Is it changing? Sex Roles, 1977, 3, 193-198.

Deutscher, I. What we say/what we do: Sentiments and acts. Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman, 1973.

Dixson, M. The real Matilda: Women and identity in Australia 1788 to 1975. Melbourne: Penguin, 1976.

Dixson, M. Women. In A.F. Davies, S. Encel, & M.J. Berry (Eds.), Australian society: A sociological introduction. (3rd ed.) Melbourne: Longman/ Cheshire, 1977.

Donelson, E. & Gullahorn, J.E. Women. A Psychological perspective. New York: John Wiley & Sons., 1977.

Durbin, J. & Stuart, A. Difference in response rates of experienced and inexperienced interviewers. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1951, 114, 163-205.

Duverger, M. The Political role of Women. UNESCO, Paris, 1955. Cited in S. Encel, N. MacKenzie & M. Tebbutt, Women and Society: An Australian Study. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1974.

Eastman, D. Self-acceptance and marital happiness. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 95-99.

Ellis, L.J. & Bentler, P.M. Traditional sex-determined role standards and sex stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1973, 25, 28-34.

Elman, J., Press, A., & Rosenkrantz, P. Sex roles and self-concepts: Real and ideal. Proceedings of the 78th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, 1970, 5, 455-456.

Encel, S., MacKenzie, N., & Tebbutt, M. Women and society: An Australian study. Melbourne: Cheshire, 1974.

Etaugh, C. & Gerson, A. Attitudes towards women: some biographical correlates. Psychological Reports, 1974, 35, 701-702.

Fand, A.B. Sex role and self-concept. Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University, 1955. Cited in A. Steinmann. A study of the concept of the feminine role of 51 middle-class American families. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1963, 67, 275-352.

Farrell, W. The liberated man. Beyond masculinity: freeing men and their relationships with women. New York: Random House, 1974.

Fazio, R.H. & Zanna, M.P. On the predictive validity of attitudes: The roles of direct experience and confidence. Journal of Personality, 1978, 46, 228-243.

Feather, N.T. Reactions to male and female success and failure at sex-linked occupations: Effects of sex and socio-economic status of respondents. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1978(a), 30, 21-40.

Feather, N.T. Factor structure of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory: Implications for the study of Masculinity, Femininity, and Androgyny. Australian Journal of Psychology, 1978(b), 30, 241-254.

Feather, N.T., O'Driscoll, M., & Nagel, T. A functional analysis of the use of titles: Miss, Mrs or Ms? In R. Rowland (Chair) Sex Roles: Research on women and men. Symposium presented at the annual conference of the Australian Psychological Society, Adelaide, August, 1977.

Fein, R.A. Men and young children. In J.H. Pleck & J. Sawyer (Eds.), Men and masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Fenwick, P. The irresponsibility of women or the irresponsibility of science? Paper presented to the 49th Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, January, 1979. Symposium: Social responsibility and Science.

Fishbein, M. & Ajzen, I. Belief, attitude, intention and behaviour: An introduction to theory and research. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1975.

Forisha, B. Sex roles and personal awareness. Morristown, New Jersey: General learning press, 1978.

Fransella, F. & Frost, K. Women: On being a woman. London: Tavistock, 1977.

Friedan, B. The feminine mystique. U.S.A.: Penguin, 1965.

Frieze, I.H., Parsons, J.E., Johnson, P.B., Ruble, D.N., & Zellman, G.L. Women and sex roles. A Social psychological perspective. New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 1978.

Gall, M.D. The relationship between masculinity-femininity and manifest anxiety. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1969, 25, 294-295.

Gaudreau, P. Factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 45, 299-302.

Gault, U. Women and psychology. Editorial to special issue, Australian Psychologist, 1975, 10, 291-292.

Gibbons, R., Ponting, J.R., & Symons, G.L. Attitudes and ideology: Correlates of liberal attitudes towards the role of women. Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 1978, 9, 20-40.

Gilbert, L.A., Deutsch, C.J., & Strahan, R.F. Feminine and masculine dimensions of the Typical, Desirable and Ideal Woman and Man. Sex Roles, 1978, 4, 767-778.

Glenn, H. & Walters, J. Feminine stress in the twentieth century. Journal of Home Economics, 1966, 58, 703-707. Cited in P.M. Cohen & C.A. Burdsal. Factor analytic examination of role attitudes of married women. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 423-434.

Goldberg, P. Are women prejudiced against women? Trans-action, 1968, 5, 28-30.

Gould, R.E. Measuring masculinity by the size of a pay check. Ms, 1973, June, 18. In J.H. Pleck & J. Sawyer (Eds.), Men and masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Gray, S.W. Masculinity-femininity in relation to anxiety and social acceptance. Child development, 1957, 28, 203-214.

Haavio-Mannila, E. Sex-role attitudes in Finland, 1966-70. Journal of Social Issues, 1972, 28, 93-110. Cited in F. Fransella & K. Frost. Women: On being a woman. London: Tavistock, 1977.

Hall, D.T. & Gordan, F.E. Career choices of married women: effects on conflict, role behaviour and satisfaction. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 58, 42-48. Cited in P.M. Cohen & C.A. Burdsal, Factor analytic examination of role attitudes of married women. Psychological Reports, 1978, 42, 423-434.

Hansson, R., Chernovetz, M.E. & Jones, W.H. Maternal employment and androgyny. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 76-78.

Hartley, R. A developmental view of female sex-role definition and identification. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1964, 10, 3-16.

Hartley, R. Sex role pressures and the socialization of the male child. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 457-68. Reprinted in J. Pleck & J. Sawyer (Eds.), Men and masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Hefner, R. & Nordin, V.D. Quoted in J. Bernard. Women, wives and mothers. Values and options. Chicago: Aldine, 1975. From Hefner, R., Nordin, V.D., et al., A model of sex-role transcendence: Role polarity and sex discrimination in education. University of Michigan Technical Proposal to National Institute of Education, Contract NIE-C-74-0144, May, 1974.

Hefner, R., Rebecca, M., & Oleshansky, B. Development of sex-role transcendence. Human Development, 1975, 18, 143-158.

Herman, M.H. & Sedlacek, W.E. Sexist attitudes among male university students. Research report #3-73, Counselling Centre, University of Maryland, 1973.

Hjelle, L.A. & Butterfield, R. Self actualization and women's attitudes toward their roles in contemporary society. The Journal of Psychology, 1974, 87, 225-230.

Hochschild, A.R. A review of sex role research. In J. Huber (Ed.), Changing Women in a changing society. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973. (Originally published as a special issue of the American Journal of Sociology).

Hogan, H.W. The measurement of psychological androgyny: an extended replication. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 1009-1013.

Hogg, M. & Lanteri, A. Women and the law. In J. Mercer (Ed.), The other half: Women in Australian society. Ringwood, Aust.: Penguin Books, 1975.

Holter, H. Sex roles and social structure. Oslo: Universitats-forlaget, 1970. Cited in F. Fransella & K. Frost. Women: On being a woman. London: Tavistock, 1977.

Hunt, F.J. (Ed.) Socialization in Australia. Sydney: Angus & Robertson, 1972.

Hutt, C. Males and females. Middlesex, Great Britain: Penguin, 1972.

Huyck, M.H. Growing older. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Jenkin, N. & Vroegh, K. Contemporary concepts of masculinity and femininity. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25, 679-697.

Jones, W.H., Chernovetz, M.E. O'C. & Hansson, R.O. The enigma of androgyny: differential implications for males and females. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 298-313.

Johnstone, R. Structural silence in the conduct of science OR why aren't scientists more use? Paper presented to the 49th Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, January, 1979. Symposium: Social responsibility and science.

Jourard, S. Some lethal aspects of the male role, from The Transparent Self, 1971. In J. Pleck & J. Sawyer (Eds.), Men and Masculinity. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Kalish, R.A. Late adulthood: perspectives on human development. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1975.

Kaplan, A.G. Androgyny as a model of marital health for women: from theory to therapy. In A.C. Kaplan & J.P. Bean (Eds.) Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.

Kaplan, A.C. & Bean, J.P. (Eds.) Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.

Kelman, H.C. Attitudes are alive and well and gainfully employed in the sphere of action. American Psychologist, 1974, 29, 310-325.

Kennedy, C.E. Human development: The adult years and aging. New York: MacMillan, 1978.

Klein, V. The stereotype of femininity. Journal of Social Issues, 1950, 6, 3-12.

Knox, W.E. & Kupferer, H.J. A discontinuity of the socialization of males in the United States. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1971, 17, 251-261.

Kohlberg, L. Moral development. In D. Sills (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: MacMillan, 1968.

Kreps, J. Sex in the market place: American women at work. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1971.

Kuhn, T.S. The Structure of Scientific revolutions (2nd ed.). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Law, H.G. The use of the Attitudes to Women Scale on Australian subjects. Australian Psychologist, 1976, 11, 303-304.

Laws, J.L. & Schwartz, P. Sexual scripts: The social construction of female sexuality. Hinsdale, Illinois: (The Dryden Press) Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1977.

Lipman-Blumen, J. & Tickamyer, A.R. Sex roles in transition: A ten-year perspective. In A. Inkeles (Ed.), Annual Review of Sociology. Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1975, 1, 297-337.

Livson, F. Sex differences in personality development in the middle adult years: a longitudinal study. Paper presented to the Gerontological Society, Kentucky, October, 1975. Cited in R.M. Vaughter, Review Essay: Psychology. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1976, 2, 120-146.

Lopata, H.Z. Occupation: Housewife. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.

Lopata, H.Z. Review essay: Sociology. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1976, 2, 165-176.

Lopata, H.Z. & Thorne, B. On the term "Sex Roles". Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1978, 4, 718-721.

Lundberg, F. & Farnham, M. Women: the lost sex. In E.M. Schur (Ed.), The family and the sexual revolution, London: Allen & Unwin, 1966.

Lunneborg, P.W. Validity of the Attitudes towards Women Scale. Psychological Reports, 1974, 34, 1281-1282.

MacBrayer, C. Differences in perception of the opposite sex by males and females. Journal of Social Psychology, 1960, 52, 309-314.

Mason, K.O., Czajka, J.L. & Arber, S. Change in U.S. Women's Sex-role attitudes, 1964-1974. American Sociological Review, 1976, 41, 573-596.

McGuire, W.J. The nature of attitudes and attitude change. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology (2nd ed.). Vol. 3, Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

McKee, J. & Sherriffs, A. Men's and women's beliefs, ideals and self-concepts. American Journal of Sociology, 1959, 64, 356-363.

Mead, M. Sex and temperament in three primitive societies. New York: Morrow, 1935.

Mercer, J. The sexist society: an introduction. In J. Mercer (Ed.), The other half: women in Australian society. Ringwood, Aust.: Penguin, 1975.

Miller, G.A. The magical number seven, plus or minus two. Psychological Review, 1956, 63, 81-97.

Millman, M. Observations on sex role research. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1971, Nov., 772-776.

Mischel, W. Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Money, J. & Ehrhardt, A.A. Man and woman, boy and girl: The differentiation and dimorphism of gender identity from conception to maturity. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1972.

Moser, C.A. & Kalton, G. Survey methods in social investigation (2nd ed.). London: Heinmann Educational Press, 1971.

Moser, C.A. & Stuart, A. An experimental study of quota sampling. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, 1953, 116, 349-405.

Myers, A.M. & Sugar, J. A critical analysis of scoring the B.S.R.I.: Implications for conceptualization. Paper presented at the annual conference of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, August, 1978.

Myrdal, A. & Klein, V. Women's two roles (2nd ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1968.

Nichols, J. Men's liberation: a new definition of masculinity. New York: Penguin, 1975.

Nunnally, J. Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967.

Oakley, A. Sex, gender and society. London: Temple Smith, 1972.

O'Leary, V. & Depner, C. College males' ideal female: changes in sex-role stereotypes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1975, 95, 139-140.

Osgood, C.E. Cross cultural comparability of attitude measurement via multi-lingual semantic differentials. In I.S. Steiner & M. Fishbein (Eds)., Recent studies in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., & Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Oskamp, S. Attitudes and opinions. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.

Osmond, M.W. & Martin, P.Y. Sex and sexism: A comparison of male and female sex-role attitudes. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 744-758.

Parelius, A.P. Emerging sex-role attitudes, expectations and strains among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1975, 37, 146-153.

Parsonson, B. Extreme response tendencies on a Semantic Differential. Psychological Reports, 1969(a), 24, 571-574.

Parsonson, B. Sex differencies in the extreme response tendencies of psychiatric patients: a function of sex-role identification. Psychological Reports, 1969(b), 25, 871-876.

Peay, M.Y. Use of the sex variable in social psychological research. Australian Psychologist, 1976, 11, 139-146.

Penman, R. Women's current and future role conceptions. Australian Psychologist, 1975, 10, 193-202.

Pleck, J.H. Masculinity-femininity. Current and alternative paradigms. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 161-178.

Pleck, J.H. The male sex role: definitions, problems and sources of change. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 155-164.

Pleck, J.H. & Sawyer, J. (Eds.) Men and masculinity. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1974.

Rebecca, M., Hefner, R., & Oleshansky, B. A model of sex-role transcendence. Journal of Social Issues, 1976, 32, 197-206. In A.C. Kaplan and J.P. Bean (Eds.), Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny. Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1976.

Reik, T. Psychology of sex relations. Farrar, Straws and Co., 1965. In N. Reeves, Womankind: beyond the stereotypes. Chicago: Aldine-Atherton, 1971.

Rogers, L. Biology and human behaviour. In J. Mercer (Ed.), The other half: Women in Australian society. Ringwood, Aust.: Penguin, 1975.

Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D.M. Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 32, 287-295.

Rossi, A.S. Equality between the sexes. In R.J. Lifton (Ed.), The Woman in America. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.

Rossi, A.S. Sex equality: the beginnings of an ideology. The Humanist, 1969, 29, 3-6. Reprinted in C. Safilios-Rothschild (Ed.), Toward a Sociology of Women. Lexington, Mass.: Xerox Corp. 1972.

Rowland, R. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Australian Psychologist, 1977, 12, 83-88.

Rowland, R.L. Does the Bem Sex-Role Inventory measure androgyny? In R. Rowland (Chair) Sex Role Research. Symposium presented at the annual Congress of the Australian and New Zealand Association for the Advancement of Science, Auckland, January, 1979.

Russell, G., Antill, J., & Cunningham, J. The measurement of masculinity, femininity and androgyny: A reply to Rowland (1977). Australian Psychologist, 1978, 13, 41-50.

Scanzoni, L. & Scanzoni, J. Men, women and change. A sociology of marriage and the family. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Sherriffs, A.C. & Jarrett, R.F. Sex differences in attitudes about sex differences. Journal of Psychology, 1953, 35, 161-168.

Sherriffs, A.C. & McKee, J.P. Qualitative aspects of beliefs about men and women. Journal of Personality, 1956, 25, 451-464.

Simpson, R.H. Specific meanings of certain terms indicating differing degrees of frequency. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1944, 30, 483-492. Cited in W. Michel, Personality and assessment. New York: Wiley, 1968.

Spence, J.T. Reliability and validity of the AWS. Personal communication to Dr. B. Walker, July, 1974.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. The Attitudes toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. J.S.A.S. Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 1972, 2, 66.

Spence, J.T. & Helmreich, R.L. Masculinity and femininity. Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents. Austin, Texas: University of Texas Press, 1978.

Spence, J.T., Helmreich, R.L., & Stapp, J. Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1975, 32, 29-39.

Stanley, G., Boots, M., & Johnson, C. Some Australian data on the short version of the Attitudes to Women Scale. Australian Psychologist, 1975, 10, 319-324.

Steinmann, A. A study of the concept of the feminine role of 51 middle-class American families. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 1963, 67, 275-352.

Steinmann, A. & Fox, D. Male-female perceptions of the female role in the United States. Journal of Psychology, 1966, 64, 265-276.

Steinmann, A. & Fox, D. Male and female perceptions of male sex roles. Proceedings of the 76th annual convention of the American Psychological Association, 1968, 421-422.

Stephenson, R. Women in Australian society. Melbourne: Heinmann Educational Press, 1970.

Stoppard, J.M. & Kalin, R. Can gender stereotypes and sex-role conceptions be distinguished? British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 17, 211-217.

Strahan, R.F. Remarks on Bem's measurement of psychological androgyny: Alternative methods and a supplementary analysis. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1975, 43, 568-571.

Summers, A. Damned whores and God's police. The Colonization of Women in Australia. Ringwood, Victoria: Penguin, 1975.

Talbo, T. Relationships between sex, sex role and social influence. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 1977, 2, 62-72.

Tomeh, A.K. Sex-role orientation: An analysis of structural and attitudinal predictors. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 341-354.

Tresemer, D. & Pleck, J. Sex-role boundaries and resistance to sex-role change. Women's Studies, 1974, 2, 61-78.

Troll, L.E. Early and middle adulthood. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1975.

Vanck, J. Time spent in housework. Scientific American, 1974, 23, 116-120.

Vaughter, R.M. Review essay: Psychology. Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 1976, 2, 120-146.

Walum, L.R. The dynamics of sex and gender: a sociological perspective. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977.

Waters, C.W., Waters, L.K., & Pincus, S. Factor analysis of masculine and feminine sex-typed items from the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Psychological Reports, 1977, 40, 567-570.

Weitz, S. Sex roles. Biological, psychological and social foundations. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Welling, M. A new androgyny measure derived from the personality research form. Paper presented to the 83rd annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, August, 1975.

Whetton, C. & Swindells, T. A factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1977, 33, 150-153.

Wiggins, J.S. & Holzmuller, A. Psychological androgyny and interpersonal behaviour. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 40-52.

Wild, R.A. Social stratification in Australia. Sydney: George, Allen and Unwin, 1978.

Williams, J.E. & Bennett, S.M. The definition of sex stereotypes via the Adjective Check List. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 327-337.

Williams, J.E., Giles, H., Edwards, J.R., Best, D.L., & Daws, J.T. Sex-trait stereotypes in England, Ireland and the United States. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1977, 16, 303-309.

Williams, J.H. Psychology of Women. Behaviour in a Biosocial context. New York: Norton, 1977.

Wilson, E.R. Women and assertive training in the Australian scene. Australian Psychologist, 1975, 10, 333-338.

Winkler, R. Psychology as a social problem: How value-free is 'objective psychology'? Australian Psychologist, 1973, 8, 120-127.

Winkler, R. What types of sex-role behaviour should behaviour modifiers promote? Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis, 1977, 10, 549-552.

Wishart, B. Political socialization and women in Australia. In J. Mercer (Ed.), The other half: Women in Australian society. Ringwood, Aust.: Penguin, 1975.

Worrell, J. Issues in the measurement and development of sex-role styles. Paper presented to the 83rd annual convention of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, August, 1975.

Worrell, J. Sex roles and psychological well-being: Perspectives on methodology. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1978, 46, 777-791.

Yorburg, B. & Arafat, I. Current sex role concepts and conflict. Sex Roles, 1975, 1, 135-145.

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF WOLLONGONG

Attitude Survey

You are one of the people in your area to be invited to help us in a special survey. This is a questionnaire to ask you your attitudes about men and women. You will be asked to describe them using some adjectives.

There are no right or wrong answers because it is your opinion that counts. All questions should be answered by placing a thick line on the coloured pink part between one pair of brackets like this: (▬▬)*

Please answer every question and if you have any problems, just ask your interviewer to help you. Work as quickly as possible and do not linger on any question.

Please note: You are not asked to give your name. This information will be completely confidential.

Thank you very much for participating in our survey. This information will help us to understand our society.

ROBYN ROWLAND,
SURVEY ORGANISER.

[*Although it was intended that the data be optically scanned, an error in the computer facility meant that eventually all questionnaires were hand-scored.]

There are four sections to this Questionnaire.

Appendix A

Section One

The purpose of this section is to measure the meanings of certain people to you, having you describe them using some adjectives. There are 5 people to be described and beneath each name is the set of adjectives.

Notice that the adjectives come in pairs and you have a choice of 7 brackets in which to place your thick line.

Example:

'If you felt that your ideal man was quite 'quick' you would answer as follows:

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Quick	( )	(▬)	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Slow

If you felt that you were not quick and not slow, you would answer like this:

	Very	Quick	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Quick	( )	( )	( )	(▬)	( )	( )	( )	Slow

The direction on the scale toward which you place your thick line depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the person described.

NOTE:
- o Do not miss out on answering any one scale
- o Never put more than one thick line between the two adjectives.
- o Do not look backwards and forwards in the section, but work steadily through it.
- o Make sure your thick line is on the pink line.

The Typical Man

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Impractical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Practical
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Un-aggressive
Active	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Passive
Not realistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Realistic
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ambitious
Not easily influenced	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Easily influenced
Rational	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Irrational
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Assertive
Secure	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Insecure
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Weak personality
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings
Dependent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Independent
Cold	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Warm
A follower	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A leader
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Rough
Incompetent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competent
Objective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Subjective
Worldly	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Home-oriented
Uncompetitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competitive
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Self-confident
Emotional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unemotional
Logical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Illogical
Unadventurous	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Adventurous
Submissive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Dominant
Consistent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Inconsistent
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unintelligent

The Typical Woman

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Impractical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Practical
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Un-aggressive
Active	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Passive
Not realistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Realistic
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ambitious
Not easily influenced	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Easily influenced
Rational	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Irrational
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Assertive
Secure	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Insecure
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Weak personality
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings
Dependent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	In-dependent
Cold	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Warm
A follower	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A leader
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Rough
Incompetent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competent
Objective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Subjective
Worldly	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Home-oriented
Un-competitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competi-tive
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Self-confident
Emotional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Un-emotional
Logical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Illogical
Un-adventurous	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ad-venturous
Submissive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Dominant
Consistent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	In-consistent
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unin-telligent

Yourself

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Impractical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Practical
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Un-aggressive
Active	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Passive
Not realistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Realistic
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ambitious
Not easily influenced	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Easily influenced
Rational	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Irrational
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Assertive
Secure	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Insecure
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Weak person-ality
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings
Dependent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	In-dependent
Cold	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Warm
A follower	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A leader
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Rough
Incompetent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competent
Objective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Subjective
Worldly	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Home-oriented
Un-competitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competi-tive
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Self-confident
Emotional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Un-emotional
Logical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Illogical
Un-adventurous	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ad-venturous
Submissive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Dominant
Consistent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	In-consistent
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unin-telligent

Your Ideal Man

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Impractical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Practical
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unaggressive
Active	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Passive
Not realistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Realistic
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ambitious
Not easily influenced	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Easily influenced
Rational	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Irrational
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Assertive
Secure	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Insecure
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Weak personality
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings
Dependent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Independent
Cold	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Warm
A follower	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A leader
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Rough
Incompetent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competent
Objective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Subjective
Worldly	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Home-oriented
Uncompetitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competitive
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Self-confident
Emotional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unemotional
Logical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Illogical
Unadventurous	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Adventurous
Submissive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Dominant
Consistent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Inconsistent
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unintelligent

Your Ideal Woman

	Very	Quite	Slightly	Neither	Slightly	Quite	Very	
Impractical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Practical
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unaggressive
Active	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Passive
Not realistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Realistic
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Ambitious
Not easily influenced	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Easily influenced
Rational	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Irrational
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Assertive
Secure	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Insecure
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Weak personality
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Uneasy when expressing tender feelings
Dependent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Independent
Cold	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Warm
A follower	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	A leader
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Rough
Incompetent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competent
Objective	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Subjective
Worldly	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Home-oriented
Uncompetitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Competitive
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Self-confident
Emotional	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unemotional
Logical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Illogical
Unadventurous	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Adventurous
Submissive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Dominant
Consistent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Inconsistent
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	Unintelligent

Appendix A

Section Two

In this section you are asked to say whether the following adjectives are desirable, undesirable or neither, for a typical mature adult (irrespective of sex).

EXAMPLE: If the adjective were 'friendly' and you think it is desirable for a mature adult to be friendly, then you would put a thick line in the bracket under desirable, like this:

	Desirable	Undesirable	Neither
Friendly	(▬)	( )	( )

Now indicate whether these adjectives are desirable, undesirable or neither for a mature adult.

	Desirable	Undesirable	Neither
Unassertive	( )	( )	( )
Consistent	( )	( )	( )
Gentle	( )	( )	( )
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )
Active	( )	( )	( )
Easily expresses tender feelings	( )	( )	( )
Intelligent	( )	( )	( )
Objective	( )	( )	( )
Unself-confident	( )	( )	( )
Unambitious	( )	( )	( )
Realistic	( )	( )	( )
Adventurous	( )	( )	( )
Insecure	( )	( )	( )
Warm	( )	( )	( )
Unemotional	( )	( )	( )
Competitive	( )	( )	( )
Unaggressive	( )	( )	( )
Illogical	( )	( )	( )
Independent	( )	( )	( )
Practical	( )	( )	( )
Dominant	( )	( )	( )
Easily influenced	( )	( )	( )
Competent	( )	( )	( )
Irrational	( )	( )	( )
Home-oriented	( )	( )	( )
A leader	( )	( )	( )

Appendix A

Section Three

In this section there is another list of adjectives. Here you are asked to use these adjectives to describe yourself. That is we would like you to indicate on a scale from 1 to 7, how true of you these various adjectives are. Please do not leave any adjective unmarked.

Example: Carefree

Mark the pink line under Column 1 if it is NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE that you are care-free.

Mark the pink line under Column 2 if it is USUALLY NOT TRUE that you are carefree.

Mark the pink line under Column 3 if it is SOMETIMES BUT INFREQUENTLY TRUE.

Mark the pink line under Column 4 if it is OCCASIONALLY TRUE.

Mark the pink line under Column 5 if it is OFTEN TRUE.

Mark the pink line under Column 6 if it is USUALLY TRUE.

Mark the pink line under Column 7 if it is ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE.

Thus if you felt that it was often true that you are carefree you would place a thick line under Column 5.

NOW DESCRIBE YOURSELF

	1 NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	2 USUALLY NOT TRUE	3 SOMETIMES TRUE	4 OCCASIONALLY TRUE	5 OFTEN TRUE	6 USUALLY TRUE	7 ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE
Self reliant	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Yielding	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Defends own beliefs	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Cheerful	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Independent	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Shy	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Athletic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Affectionate	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Assertive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Flatterable	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Strong personality	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Loyal	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Forceful	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Feminine	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Analytical	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Sympathetic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Has leadership abilities	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

	1 NEVER OR ALMOST NEVER TRUE	2 USUALLY NOT TRUE	3 SOMETIMES TRUE	4 OCCASIONALLY TRUE	5 OFTEN TRUE	6 USUALLY TRUE	7 ALWAYS OR ALMOST ALWAYS TRUE
Sensitive to the needs of others	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Willing to take risk	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Understanding	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Makes decisions easily	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Compassionate	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Self-sufficient	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Dominant	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Soft-spoken	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Masculine	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Warm	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Willing to take a stand	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Tender	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Aggressive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Gullible	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Acts as a leader	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Childlike	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Individualistic	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Does not use harsh language	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Competitive	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Loves children	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Ambitious	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )
Gentle	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )	( )

Appendix A

Section Four

This is the last section. Here are some statements which describe the attitudes towards the roles of men and women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you:

A - Agree strongly; B - Agree mildly; C - Disagree mildly; or D - Disagree strongly.

Please indicate your opinion by placing a thick line under Column A or B or C or D.

	A Agree Strongly	B Agree Mildly	C Disagree Mildly	D Disagree Strongly
1. Women in Australia should take more responsibility than they have in trying to influence decisions of political and social importance.	( )	( )	( )	( )
2. Regardless of whether or not they have children, women should work outside the home if that is what they want to do.	( )	( )	( )	( )
3. A woman should not consider her own needs more than her family's when taking a job.	( )	( )	( )	( )
4. Working wives should leave their jobs if their husbands want them to.	( )	( )	( )	( )
5. Having children and bringing them up should be the most important thing in a woman's life.	( )	( )	( )	( )
6. Women should be content to remain at home and do all the housework.	( )	( )	( )	( )
7. Men should get preference for jobs even if the women who apply have the same qualifications.	( )	( )	( )	( )
8. Loose sexual behaviour is understandable and acceptable in a man.	( )	( )	( )	( )
9. Most men would not be capable of learning to run a home and cook a meal.	( )	( )	( )	( )

		A Agree Strongly	B Agree Mildly	C Disagree Mildly	D Disagree Strongly
10.	Married men should be able to stay at home and look after the children while their wives work to support them.	( )	( )	( )	( )
11.	Women should have full control of their persons and give or withhold sex intimacy as they choose.	( )	( )	( )	( )
12.	A husband should not encourage his wife to work even if she wishes to.	( )	( )	( )	( )
13.	Married women should only work when more money is needed to improve the family's standard of living.	( )	( )	( )	( )
14.	Under modern economic conditions with women active outside the home, men should share the household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.	( )	( )	( )	( )
15.	Single women should try to develop a career which interests them rather than just waiting to get married.	( )	( )	( )	( )
16.	Men should not be encouraged to show their emotions and cry as women do.	( )	( )	( )	( )
17.	On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contributing to economic production than men.	( )	( )	( )	( )
18.	The husband should not be favoured by law over the wife in the disposal of family income or property.	( )	( )	( )	( )
19.	It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.	( )	( )	( )	( )
20.	Men should be more interested in political affairs than women.	( )	( )	( )	( )
21.	Men should be able to lean on their wives or girlfriends for financial and emotional security.	( )	( )	( )	( )
22.	Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.	( )	( )	( )	( )

	A Agree Strongly	B Agree Mildly	C Disagree Mildly	D Disagree Strongly
23. Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expenses when they go out together.	( )	( )	( )	( )
24. The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.	( )	( )	( )	( )
25. Marriage should make as little difference to a woman's career as it does to a man's.	( )	( )	( )	( )
26. Parental authority and responsibility for discipline of the children should be equally divided between husband and wife.	( )	( )	( )	( )
27. Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.	( )	( )	( )	( )
28. Men should be largely concerned with earning a good living.	( )	( )	( )	( )
29. The intellectual leadership of the community should be largely in the hands of men.	( )	( )	( )	( )
30. Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.	( )	( )	( )	( )
31. Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.	( )	( )	( )	( )
32. Men should not be allowed to enter traditionally female careers such as secretarial work, nursing and midwifery.	( )	( )	( )	( )
33. There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.	( )	( )	( )	( )

Appendix A

Questions relating to Biographical Details

Before you finish, could you please answer the following:

Sex: Male ( ) Female ( )

Age: 18 - 24 ( ) 35 - 44 ( ) 55 - 64 ( )
25 - 34 ( ) 45 - 54 ( ) 65 & over ( )

Marital status: Married ( ) Single ( ) Divorced ( )
Separated ( ) Remarried ( ) Cohabiting ( ).

Level of education reached: Primary ( ) Tertiary-Technical College ( )
Lower secondary - Intermediate ( ) University ( )
- School Certificate ( ) Post-graduate ( )
Upper secondary - Leaving ( ) Other ( )
- H.S.C. ( )

Occupation: Type A ( ) Home duties.

Type B ( ) e.g., Doctor, Professor, Solicitor, Dentist, Engineer, Company Manager, Gentleman Farmer.

Type C ( ) e.g., Teacher, Social Worker, Accountant, Land Agent, Insurance Agent, Works Manager, Carpenter, Car Salesman, Post-office clerk, Farmer, Electrician.

Type D ( ) e.g., Shop assistant, Painter, Bricklayer, Fireman, Housekeeper, Taxi driver, Milkman, Petrol Station Attendant.

Occupation of other partner (if applicable)

Type A ( ) Type B ( ) Type C ( ) Type D ( )

Which social class do you feel your attitudes are similar to:

Working class ( ) Middle class ( )
Lower Middle class ( ) Upper class ( )

Are you Australian born: Yes ( ) No ( )

Was your mother Australian born: Yes ( ) No ( )
Was your father Australian born: Yes ( ) No ( )

Appendix B

ATTITUDES TOWARD WOMEN SCALE

The statements listed below describe attitudes toward the role of women in society which different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. You are asked to express your feelings about each statement by indicating whether you (A) Agree strongly, (B) Agree mildly, (C) Disagree mildly, or (D) Disagree strongly. Please indicate your opinion by circling A or B or C or D for each question.

(A) Agree strongly (B) Agree mildly (C) Disagree mildly (D) Disagree strongly

1.	Women have an obligation to be faithful to their husbands.	A	B	C	D
2.	Swearing and obscenity is more repulsive in the speech of a woman than a man.	A	B	C	D
3.	The satisfaction of her husband's sexual desires is a fundamental obligation of every wife.	A	B	C	D
4.	Divorced men should help support their children but should not be required to pay alimony if their wives are capable of working.	A	B	C	D
5.	Under ordinary circumstances, men should be expected to pay all the expenses while they're out on a date.	A	B	C	D
6.	Women should take increasing responsibility for leadership in solving the intellectual and social problems of the day.	A	B	C	D
7.	It is all right for wives to have an occasional, casual, extramarital affair.	A	B	C	D
8.	Special attentions like standing up for a woman who comes into a room or giving her a seat on a crowded bus are outmoded and should be discontinued.	A	B	C	D
9.	Vocational and professional schools should admit the best qualified students, independent of sex.	A	B	C	D
10.	Both husband and wife should be allowed the same grounds for divorce.	A	B	C	D
11.	Telling dirty jokes should be mostly a masculine prerogative.	A	B	C	D
12.	Husbands and wives should be equal partners in planning the family budget.	A	B	C	D
13.	Men should continue to show courtesies to women such as holding open the door or helping them on with their coats.	A	B	C	D

(A) Agree strongly (B) Agree mildly (C) Disagree mildly (D) Disagree strongly

14.	Women should claim alimony not as persons incapable of self-support but only when there are children to provide for or when the burden of starting life anew after the divorce is obviously heavier for the wife.	A	B	C	D
15.	Intoxication among women is worse than intoxication among men.	A	B	C	D
16.	The initiative in dating should come from the man.	A	B	C	D
17.	Under modern economic conditions with women being active outside the home, men should share in household tasks such as washing dishes and doing the laundry.	A	B	C	D
18.	It is insulting to women to have the "obey" clause remain in the marriage service.	A	B	C	D
19.	There should be a strict merit system in job appointment and promotion without regard to sex.	A	B	C	D
20.	A woman should be as free as a man to propose marriage.	A	B	C	D
21.	Parental authority and responsibility for discipline of the children should be equally divided between husband and wife.	A	B	C	D
22.	Women should worry less about their rights and more about becoming good wives and mothers.	A	B	C	D
23.	Women earning as much as their dates should bear equally the expense when they go out together.	A	B	C	D
24.	Women should assume their rightful place in business and all the professions along with men.	A	B	C	D
25.	A woman should not expect to go to exactly the same places or to have quite the same freedom of action as a man.	A	B	C	D
26.	Sons in a family should be given more encouragement to go to college than daughters.	A	B	C	D
27.	It is ridiculous for a woman to run a locomotive and for a man to darn socks.	A	B	C	D
28.	It is childish for a woman to assert herself by retaining her maiden name after marriage.	A	B	C	D
29.	Society should regard the services rendered by the women workers as valuable as those of men.	A	B	C	D

(A) Agree strongly (B) Agree mildly (C) Disagree mildly (D) Disagree strongly

30.	It is only fair that male workers should receive more pay than women even for identical work.	A	B	C	D
31.	In general, the father should have greater authority than the mother in the bringing up of children.	A	B	C	D
32.	Women should be encouraged not to become sexually intimate with anyone before marriage, even their fiances.	A	B	C	D
33.	Woman should demand money for household and personal expenses as a right rather than as a gift.	A	B	C	D
34.	The husband should not be favoured by law over the wife in the disposal of family property or income.	A	B	C	D
35.	Wifely submission is an outworn virtue.	A	B	C	D
36.	There are some professions and types of businesses that are more suitable for men than women.	A	B	C	D
37.	Women should be concerned with their duties of child-bearing and house-tending, rather than with desires for professional and business careers.	A	B	C	D
38.	The intellectual leadership of a community should be largely in the hands of men.	A	B	C	D
39.	A wife should make every effort to minimize irritation and inconvenience to the male head of the family.	A	B	C	D
40.	There should be no greater barrier to an unmarried woman having sex with a casual acquaintance than having dinner with him.	A	B	C	D
41.	Economic and social freedom is worth far more to women than acceptance of the ideal of femininity which has been set by men.	A	B	C	D
42.	Women should take the passive role in courtship.	A	B	C	D
43.	On the average, women should be regarded as less capable of contribution to economic production than are men.	A	B	C	D
44.	The intellectual equality of woman with man is perfectly obvious.	A	B	C	D
45.	Women should have full control of their persons and give or withhold sex intimacy as they choose.	A	B	C	D

(A) Agree strongly (B) Agree mildly (C) Disagree mildly (D) Disagree strongly

46.	The husband has in general no obligation to inform his wife of his financial plans.	A	B	C	D
47.	There are many jobs in which men should be given preference over women in being hired or promoted.	A	B	C	D
48.	Women with children should not work outside the home if they don't have to financially.	A	B	C	D
49.	Women should be given equal opportunity with men for apprenticeship in the various trades.	A	B	C	D
50.	The relative amounts of time and energy to be devoted to household duties on the one hand and to a career on the other should be determined by personal desires and interests rather than by sex.	A	B	C	D
51.	As head of the household, the husband should have more responsibility for the family's financial plans than his wife.	A	B	C	D
52.	If both husband and wife agree that sexual fidelity isn't important, there's no reason why both shouldn't have extramarital affairs if they want to.	A	B	C	D
53.	The husband should be regarded as the legal representative of the family group in all matters of law.	A	B	C	D
54.	The modern girl is entitled to the same freedom from regulation and control that is given to the modern boy.	A	B	C	D
55.	Most women need and want the kind of protection and support that men have traditionally given them.	A	B	C	D

Appendix C

Frequencies for the three collapsed rating points on the BSRI for the Masculine, Feminine, Androgynous and Undifferentiated groups. Male and female (italicised) data are presented.

BSRI item		Masculine		Feminine		Androgynous		Undifferentiated	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Self-reliant	1	1	-	1	*3*	2	-	2	*1*
	4	10	-	1	*13*	7	*5*	16	*12*
	7	44	*15*	10	*41*	35	*32*	25	*23*
Yielding	1	23	*6*	1	*3*	6	*3*	8	*7*
	4	26	*6*	9	*36*	13	*15*	25	*23*
	7	5	*3*	1	*18*	23	*19*	9	*6*
Defends beliefs	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	4	*3*
	4	4	-	3	*4*	1	*1*	11	*7*
	7	47	*15*	7	*53*	42	*35*	27	*27*
Cheerful	1	-	-	-	*1*	-	-	3	*3*
	4	16	*5*	2	*6*	4	*1*	17	*12*
	7	39	*10*	10	*51*	40	*36*	23	*21*
Independent	1	-	-	-	*5*	-	-	5	*2*
	4	2	-	3	*8*	0	*5*	7	*12*
	7	53	*15*	9	*46*	40	*32*	31	*22*
Shy	1	24	*7*	2	*10*	14	*12*	10	*8*
	4	15	*7*	4	*23*	15	*11*	21	*19*
	7	15	*1*	6	*26*	14	*14*	11	*9*
Athletic	1	9	*7*	4	*40*	5	*12*	10	*17*
	4	16	*1*	3	*14*	17	*10*	18	*15*
	7	29	*7*	5	*5*	21	*13*	12	*5*
Affectionate	1	3	*1*	-	-	1	*1*	6	-
	4	18	*2*	-	*3*	-	-	17	*17*
	7	33	*12*	12	*56*	42	*35*	19	*19*
Assertive	1	6	-	3	*16*	1	-	9	*10*
	4	14	*5*	6	*23*	13	*9*	28	*22*
	7	34	*10*	3	*20*	30	*28*	5	*5*
Flatterable	1	29	*7*	5	*13*	8	*8*	15	*13*
	4	17	*5*	3	*32*	10	*9*	17	*13*
	7	7	*3*	3	*14*	25	*19*	8	*10*

BSRI item		Masculine		Feminine		Androgynous		Undifferentiated	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Strong personality	1	-	-	1	*11*	-	-	7	*6*
	4	13	*2*	5	*20*	8	*4*	22	*17*
	7	41	*13*	6	*28*	36	*33*	13	*14*
Loyal	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	3	*2*
	4	9	*1*	-	*1*	-	-	10	*6*
	7	45	*14*	11	*58*	44	*37*	29	*29*
Forceful	1	5	*1*	6	*33*	8	*3*	17	*14*
	4	5	*2*	4	*17*	15	*14*	23	*17*
	7	45	*12*	2	*8*	21	*20*	2	*5*
Feminine	1	54	-	8	*1*	41	*1*	39	*3*
	4	-	*5*	2	*3*	1	*2*	2	*13*
	7	-	*10*	1	*55*	2	*34*	-	*18*
Analytical	1	7	*2*	2	*14*	7	*3*	10	*5*
	4	16	*2*	3	*19*	9	*8*	25	*24*
	7	32	*11*	6	*26*	28	*24*	5	*8*
Sympathetic	1	4	-	-	-	-	*1*	9	*1*
	4	20	*1*	-	*1*	-	*2*	14	*9*
	7	30	*14*	12	*58*	44	*34*	19	*26*
Has leadership abilities	1	2	-	4	*35*	1	*1*	13	*14*
	4	8	*5*	4	*22*	7	*13*	19	*18*
	7	45	*9*	4	*2*	36	*23*	11	*5*
Sensitive to the needs of others	1	10	-	-	*1*	1	-	8	*1*
	4	13	*2*	-	*2*	1	-	14	*15*
	7	32	*13*	12	*56*	42	*37*	21	*20*
Willing to take risks	1	4	-	1	*14*	2	*6*	9	*9*
	4	12	*4*	7	*29*	6	*10*	21	*22*
	7	39	*11*	4	*16*	36	*21*	12	*6*
Understanding	1	1	-	-	-	1	*1*	3	-
	4	14	*3*	-	*1*	2	*3*	18	*12*
	7	40	*12*	12	*58*	40	*32*	21	*24*
Makes decisions easily	1	1	*1*	4	*21*	6	*4*	10	*4*
	4	9	*2*	8	*18*	6	*7*	20	*22*
	7	45	*11*	-	*20*	31	*25*	12	*11*

BSRI item		Masculine		Feminine		Androgynous		Undifferentiated	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Compassionate	1	3	-	-	-	-	-	6	*3*
	4	25	*5*	1	*6*	5	*3*	21	*17*
	7	25	*10*	10	*53*	38	*34*	15	*17*
Self-sufficient	1	1	-	-	*6*	1	*1*	5	*3*
	4	7	*3*	5	*23*	3	*2*	22	*15*
	7	46	*12*	7	*29*	40	*34*	15	*18*
Eager to soothe hurt feelings	1	9	*1*	1	-	-	-	7	*8*
	4	25	*2*	3	*7*	4	*2*	14	*15*
	7	21	*11*	7	*51*	40	*35*	21	*13*
Dominant	1	7	*2*	6	*34*	8	*4*	14	*16*
	4	12	*1*	5	*19*	18	*17*	26	*15*
	7	36	*12*	1	*6*	18	*16*	1	*4*
Soft-spoken	1	25	*3*	-	*5*	3	*9*	13	*9*
	4	15	*9*	6	*11*	11	*6*	18	*18*
	7	14	*3*	6	*43*	30	*21*	12	*9*
Masculine	1	1	*9*	1	*58*	-	*31*	7	*27*
	4	2	*5*	1	-	3	*2*	8	*5*
	7	52	-	10	*1*	41	*3*	28	*4*
Warm	1	2	*1*	-	-	-	-	6	*3*
	4	23	*5*	-	*1*	1	*1*	12	*13*
	7	30	*9*	12	*58*	43	*35*	25	*21*
Willing to take a stand	1	1	-	-	*4*	-	*1*	2	*4*
	4	6	*2*	3	*24*	2	*1*	23	*17*
	7	48	*13*	9	*31*	42	*34*	18	*16*
Tender	1	4	-	-	-	2	-	9	*4*
	4	29	*6*	1	*4*	2	-	15	*16*
	7	22	*9*	11	*55*	40	*35*	18	*16*
Aggressive	1	2	*3*	7	*41*	14	*3*	15	*18*
	4	18	*3*	3	*17*	12	*18*	25	*19*
	7	32	*9*	2	*1*	18	*14*	1	-
Gullible	1	37	*9*	8	*34*	25	*19*	23	*19*
	4	11	*5*	3	*12*	10	*10*	16	*13*
	7	7	*1*	-	*12*	8	*7*	3	*3*

BSRI item		Masculine		Feminine		Androgynous		Undifferentiated	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Acts as a leader	1	1	*2*	5	*39*	4	*3*	18	*17*
	4	14	*6*	7	*18*	18	*14*	17	*15*
	7	40	*7*	-	*2*	22	*19*	6	*5*
Childlike	1	42	*11*	5	*42*	27	*21*	26	*24*
	4	8	*3*	5	*11*	8	*9*	12	*12*
	7	3	*1*	1	*5*	8	*2*	3	-
Individualistic	1	2	*2*	1	*8*	3	*1*	10	*9*
	4	6	*3*	5	*18*	8	*4*	19	*18*
	7	45	*9*	5	*31*	31	*29*	11	*8*
No harsh language	1	29	*6*	2	*22*	13	*12*	20	*17*
	4	15	*6*	5	*10*	11	*7*	13	*10*
	7	10	*3*	5	*27*	20	*16*	9	*9*
Competitive	1	2	-	4	*26*	1	*4*	11	*12*
	4	7	*3*	6	*25*	4	*9*	20	*19*
	7	43	*12*	2	*8*	38	*23*	10	*4*
Loves children	1	2	*1*	-	*1*	-	*1*	6	*1*
	4	11	*3*	-	*3*	-	*1*	8	*9*
	7	39	*11*	12	*55*	44	*34*	28	*26*
Ambitious	1	3	-	1	*15*	2	*1*	7	*6*
	4	2	*3*	5	*23*	5	*8*	22	*20*
	7	50	*12*	6	*21*	37	*27*	14	*11*
Gentle	1	7	-	-	-	-	-	8	*1*
	4	18	*6*	-	*1*	-	*2*	11	*17*
	7	30	*9*	12	*58*	44	*34*	24	*19*